THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

The Bishop of Chelmsford carried on a correspondence recently with an intelligent sixth-form boy who could not bring himself to believe in the Christian religion. These 'Letters to Timothy,' twelve in number, have now been published under the title of *Your Faith—or Your Life!* (Longmans; 3s. 6d. net). The decision to publish is well taken, for the letters have a genuine ring about them, are full of wise Christian teaching, and deal in a plain and effective way with the very difficulties which would trouble young and inquiring minds.

The Bishop, to begin with, rightly stresses the fact that the world-situation of to-day calls for decision. We are not in a position to sit still and deal with Christian truth in a calm and speculative way. The world is in a highly dangerous state, and the whole moral outlook is profoundly disquieting. It would be the most fatal error to imagine that Christian morality can live without Christian doctrine. 'All that is wholesome in our civilization has come from generations of training in the Christian Faith, and it is most unlikely that what is a by-product of the Faith will survive if the Faith itself perishes.' In these circumstances, when our Christian civilization is threatened with destruction, we must make up our minds where we are going to stand, and which side we are going to back. 'If the Lord be God follow him, but if Baal, then follow him': that is the issue.

It will not do to hold this great issue in suspense until we have discussed all manner of subsidiary questions and settled all our intellectual difficulties. 'The sensible way to proceed is surely to clarify the mind on the great outstanding truths for which Christianity stands and then we can in a more leisurely way fill in the details. But to argue about details at the start means that we shall never get anywhere. No sensible person will argue whether Oliver Cromwell's wart was on the left or right side of his nose (or was it on his face?) until he has satisfied himself that the wart-bearer actually lived.'

The first question, therefore, to be tackled is 'What think ye of Christ?' And that question must be tackled in a serious spirit, not in the tone of lofty superiority and patronizing contempt with which people sometimes assail Christianity. 'No branch of thought is treated in the same way as religion. In all other realms the people who have studied the subject are recognized as authorities and their opinions are given weight. But when it comes to Christianity it seems to be assumed that any public figure is entitled to make a pronouncement upon it, and the opinions of such people are gulped down by young men and women as the latest and final word on this subject which is surely the most important of all.'

The Christian belief in the Divinity of Jesus Christ is a tremendous faith, and one not lightly to be accepted: but also, not lightly to be rejected. It is commended to us by an overwhelming consensus of Christian opinion and an impressive weight of Christian experience. 'If I found that all the most musical people I knew were agreed that Beethoven's Symphonies reached the high-water mark of orchestrated music, I should not feel I was a fool if I accepted their opinion. I hope I might suspect that I was a self-opinionated prig

if I did not at least receive this verdict with respect and do my best to examine the grounds of this belief.'

And when it is thus examined reasonable grounds can be shown for this belief. We are agreed that there is a God, and that He is the Author of all good. This is a reasonable postulate, for otherwise we could not account for the goodness that is in human nature. Unless we are to suppose that man's best is higher than God, we must believe in a God of surpassing love and goodness. But love and goodness in man compel him to help the helpless, to succour the needy, to raise the fallen. The better a man is the more irresistible is this impulse. So we must conceive that God, being what He is, must be under the compulsion of His own infinite love to come to the aid of fallen man. And this He has done effectively in His Son, our Saviour Jesus Christ. A tremendous faith, but fully in harmony with man's highest thought of God.

When we come to examine more closely the life and teaching of Jesus Christ we get the impression of something unique. It is easy in a vague way to class Him with other great teachers of the world, but more careful and detailed investigation deepens the impression that there is none like Him. 'He stands apart in a class by Himself, unique and unrivalled.' For one thing He is always the teacher, the master, and never the inquirer. 'In all the subjects with which He is concerned He speaks as one who *knows*.' And there is something universal in His teaching and deathless in His words. They belong to every race and to every age. Spoken in the first century, they are as fresh as the day He spoke them. Moreover, there is power in them. They are 'spirit and life' as the words of no other teacher are. Many a man, sick of life, broken and helpless, has read His words, and they have healed and restored him. His words have driven men and women into action everywhere and at all times. 'Just one illustration must serve. You remember Christ's teaching about children? He took them up in His arms and blessed them. Suffer little children to come unto Me. It was because of those words that a young doctor in 1865 devoted his life to the service of friendless and homeless children. That is how Dr. Barnardo's Homes began, through Christ's words in action.'

Of course the miraculous element in Christianity comes to the front as a supreme stumbling-block in the way of faith. At this point the critic becomes specially scornful and proudly confident. Miracles, he affirms, are violations of the laws of Nature and contrary to the findings of modern science. Such affirmations, he must be told, are based on a mechanistic view of the world which held the field for a season but is rapidly becoming antiquated. The world is no closed system or self-acting machine. If there is a living God at all He holds the world at every moment and in every part completely within His control. The realm of the unknown is so vast and the element of mystery so all-pervasive that he would be a very bold and presumptuous dogmatist who would affirm without regard to the evidence that certain events could never have happened.

A very good case can be made out for the Christian miracles, not only as an integral part of the gospel story, but as being in harmony with that kind of God, living and active, holy and loving, which the Christian faith presents. It will be found on examination that the miraculous element cannot be eliminated without tearing the gospel narrative to shreds, and that a non-miraculous version of Christianity is bloodless and ineffective. We do not believe in Christ because of the miracles, but, on the contrary, we accept the miracles because we believe in Him. If He 'spake as never man spake,' is it unreasonable to believe that He wrought deeds such as no other ever did? His whole life is the miracle, and we are not surprised to learn that mighty works were done by Him.

Above all there is the crowning miracle of the Resurrection, by which the Christian Faith stands or falls. If Christ be not risen our Faith is vain. But we rest upon the impressive witness of the Apostles and the self-authenticating power of the gospel of the Resurrection. 'The supreme argument, and one that has never been answered, is that nothing less than unmistakable evidence that their Master was truly alive could have rallied the broken and

dispirited disciples from their hopeless despair and united them into a solid body of people, fearless and determined, and ready to die for the truth to which they bore testimony. In other words, there would have been no Christian Church had there been no Easter Day.'

The Reverend H. K. Archdall, M.A., Th.Soc., Principal of St. David's College, Lampeter, preached a sermon a few months ago before the University of Cambridge which is a thoughtful and timely contribution to the question of the nature of Christian Righteousness. He would have Christian people cherish no illusion as to the mental climate of our modern world on the whole question of righteousness; and he would remind them that righteousness—as Christianity understands it—has something to do with theology, that indeed it is the result of a relation with the Holy and Gracious God, who alone saves man from himself.

It is the tragedy of our modern world that men have come to think that righteousness is a matter of social arrangements which could readily be established, if only the control of social machinery could be placed in the hands of certain moral reformers. But the Christian teaching concerning righteousness is not mere morality; it is moral theology. In the Gospels and Epistles and in Christian doctrine all down the ages ethics depends upon dogmatics, and it is futile to think that Christian Righteousness can be properly expounded apart from the theological doctrines—of God and man and their relations—in which it is embedded.

The movement of our time which the preacher singles out for particular discussion is that of 'secularist humanism.' By this he understands the type of thought which, while avoiding any belief in God and Immortality, would hold on to goodness and maintain a purely this-worldly outlook. He would point out three main dilemmas facing secularist humanism, which proves its hopeless inadequacy as a basis for life.

First of all, there is the psychological dilemma of a futile optimism and a morbid despair. On the one hand, a merely moral creed, which acknowledges no dependence upon an invisible and eternal world, produces a self-complacency which leads to the assertion of moral intuitions rather than to effective moral action. There are some among us to-day who hold that, as we are not without faults as a nation, we cannot properly assume the rôle of defenders of international morality. The result of secularist complacency is inability to act in a timely fashion and the opening up of the way to pessimism.

The second dilemma, which the preacher discusses more pointedly, is that between the claims of the individual and the claims of society. Here again no resolution can be effected on a naturalistic basis. On such a basis we are confronted with the dualism of self-expression and self-sacrifice; there is no real principle whether of individuality or of fellowship. But how is it that self-expression and self-sacrifice partially coincide in practice? How is it that we can entertain the hope of the area of their coincidence being increased? Only against the background of God and Immortality may we say that the more really human a man is, the more truly individual he will be and the more his capacity for fellowship will be developed.

The third dilemma of the secularist humanist is that he is quite unable to explain the absoluteness of either the moral obligation or the moral ideal, and thus to unite the form and the content of morality. The two aspects of moral action, action done for duty's sake and action to realize some good end, each involve a reference to the Absolute, in the one case an Absolute Imperative, in the other, an Absolute Good; and they cannot be identified or derived from each other, except through a reference to the Eternal God.

It is only then on a supernatural basis that the contradictions between optimism and pessimism, between the individual and society, between action for duty's sake and action for the realization of the good, are resolved. But the preacher dissociates himself from any theological attempt to sever eschatology from ethics in the interests of escapist religion. In other words, he argues for

an eschatology organically related to history, for the linking of moral effort to the revelation of the Divine Righteousness in the Kingdom of God. We must not be content with the shining of the True light on another shore than the confines of this dark world. 'That way lies Buddhism and not the Religion of the Incarnation.'

The problem for the Church is 'to hold on, at one and the same time, to that state of heavenly grace and perfection which is the realized Kingdom of God and to that state of moral probation which on life's various levels is our human lot, till time passes into eternity—and to find out how to make the tension between these two into a creative tension: so that in any particular moral task in history the ability to wring triumph out of tragedy and order out of chaos will be at once an expression of God's redeeming action upon us and a preparation to receive that action more adequately. Only when we run eagerly to every one of these particular moral tasks with the conviction that they have to do with God's hold upon us and our hold upon God can we avoid escapist religion.'

A concluding sentence admirably states the meaning of the whole, uniting theology, ethics, and eschatology in the conception of Christian Righteousness: 'Because social reform at its best and wisest can only create conditions of terrestrial justice and cannot of itself be ever identified with the action of the Kingdom of God, this does not prove that social reform is not necessary but only that it cannot be successful unless the material action is the sacramental expression of moral and spiritual obedience.'

In the *Congregational Quarterly* for July Dr. W. B. SELBIE has an article on 'Theology in the Modern World' which is both timely and suggestive. It may be taken for granted, he says, that our modern world has little or no use for theology. One main reason, no doubt, is the prevalence of a world-view which is summarily described as Humanism. Man sees himself as master of his fate and captain of his soul. Hence the Communist and Fascist ideologies, the worship of nation and race and the psychological determinism which leave God out of the picture and see in religion nothing but a form of infantilism.

But there is another reason. Professor MacNeile Dixon, in his great Gifford Lectures, writes that 'a religion which is to live must be fitted into the whole system of the believer's thought, directing as well as inspiring his every decision, both public and private. It should provide him with a touch-stone, a way of looking at Nature, the world and himself which harmonizes his ideas and meets his daily requirements. The principles of a man's religion (*i.e.* his theology) should be in the most intimate relation with his secular occupations and undertakings and these principles so clearly defined as to assist and support all his judgments.'

Dr. SELBIE takes this as a text, and says that if theology is at a discount to-day it is largely because it has ceased to speak to men in living tones. It is true, of course, that the central affirmations of the Christian faith remain: the revelation of God in Christ, sin, redemption, and eternal life. What we are concerned with, however, is how they can be brought home and made real to the men and women of to-day. The whole future of the Christian Church depends now on its capacity to preach the gospel committed to it in terms which will meet the needs, and appeal to the understanding, of the present generation.

There are two ways of doing this, the prophetic and the priestly, the dynamic and the static. Dr. SELBIE has no doubt as to which is the better. The prophet declares the living Word of God directly. And this suggests to Dr. SELBIE his first point in any modern presentation of the Christian faith. It is a revelation, a Word of God to man. But this conception implies something not only about God but also about man. Christian theology presupposes an anthropology, and its doctrine of man is every bit as integral to it as is its doctrine of God. It is a doctrine as far removed from the self-sufficiency of humanism as it is from the pessimism of the dialectic theology. It regards man as a child of God. He is a lost child, deeply fallen and yet capable of rising and of responding to the saving

grace of God. Man's alienation from God is a tragic reality, but it is wholly unnatural. Hence the malaise, the unrest, and the despair from which multitudes are suffering in these days, and for which the only cure is the restoration of normal relations with God.

But there is a prior question, raised by the mention of the priestly or static form of religion. It is the question of assurance or authority. We are living in difficult times and escapism is popular. People are afraid, and want above everything to feel safe. Hence the attraction of a religion of authority, of an infallible Church, or Bible, or Dogma, anything to relieve the individual of responsibility. Hence, too, the swing away from such religion on the part of intelligent young people who will have none of this infallibility. So long as theology has no better credentials than these it will make no appeal to the outside world. Those who speak in its name will have to be more candid and courageous. As Christian teachers it is essential that we should persuade men that we are out for the truth and nothing else.

Our ultimate authority is nothing less than God Himself, who is the truth and who has given to men His Spirit to lead them into all truth. Now, where the Spirit of the Lord is there is liberty, and we must be free to follow whithersoever the Spirit of God may lead us. But is not this liberty a dangerous thing? Who knows into what vagaries and extravagances it may lead? What criterion or guarantee have we that at any given moment we are listening to the voice of God and not to our own unconscious desires or wishful thinking? The answer is to be found in the whole modern presentation of theology. Christian theology is a theology of revelation, and therefore it must be a theology of *experience*.

But this experience is not merely subjective. There is no experience which is *merely* subjective. Every experience is a response to something or some one. It is unfortunate that the fear of subjectivity should have driven many to the opposite extreme of ignoring experience altogether. It is argued that religion is all revelation, and that man has nothing to do with it. We must refuse this assertion. Man has everything to do with it. Religion is revelation, but it has to be received by man, and this reception is the response of his whole personality. The theology of the New Testament is a theology of experience. It is a witness given by men who found God in Christ. And our theology to-day must be of this nature—a witness to the truths by which men live.

Two conclusions follow from this. One is the folly of requiring men to give a whole-hearted assent to the ancient creeds as the condition of being accounted Christian. Dr. SELBIE admits the value of creeds. But the absolute use of them as permanent tests or standards of orthodoxy is dangerous and misleading. The Church cannot dispense with statements of doctrine, but these should not be made passports to the Christian name. What we badly need to-day is simplicity. We need only the truths of which it can be said, 'By these things men live.' These are few and comparatively simple.

The second conclusion is that theology must be more ethical and, as a consequence, less metaphysical. This is as much as to say that our theology must be more Christian. There is a great deal in some forms of orthodox theology which can by no stretch of imagination be called Christian because it is wholly inconsistent with the character of God as made known in Jesus Christ. In this connexion Dr. SELBIE makes a forcible attack on the report of the Anglican Commission on Christian Doctrine, 'a report which reveals the futility of the merely ecclesiastical approach to theological problems and the need there is for a more candid and modernized presentation of the Christian faith.' It is especially the doctrine of God as presented in this report that Dr. SELBIE criticises. It is treated more as a problem than as a gospel. The statement is too much under the influence of Jewish and pagan ideas of God, and is typical of a theological method and temper which are surely by this time obsolete. Theology will never appeal to our time if it gets away from the Spirit and simplicity that are in Christ.

Constructive Theology.

XII. Church and Sacraments.

By William Fulton, D.D., Professor of Divinity in the University of Glasgow and Principal of Trinity College.

It has been justly remarked that to-day the phrase 'Church and Sacraments' suggests, not fellowship, but division; so bitter have been the controversies as to what constitutes the Church, and what are the nature and efficacy of the Sacraments. But the aim of this article is to emphasize fellowship rather than division. It seeks to be constructive without being critical, or at least directly critical. Accordingly, it avoids controversial issues so far as seems possible. For instance, in treating of the doctrine of the Church it does not enter into the issue between 'Catholic' and 'Evangelical,' or into questions of ministry and government. Indeed, it is content in treating of this doctrine to indicate the close relationship between the Church and the Sacraments. Or again, in treating of the doctrine of the Sacraments no attempt is made to expound the theory of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, showing the connexion of the symbol with the blessing symbolized. How, more especially, are the symbols of bread and wine in the Lord's Supper related to the blessing of the real presence of Christ? A question which raises again old controversies of the Reformation age.

A primary consideration is that of the Dominical institution of Church and Sacraments: did the Lord institute in any real and true sense the Christian Church and the two great Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper? It may be here observed that the question of Dominical institution, while applicable to Baptism and the Lord's Supper, those 'Sacraments of the Gospel,' is not so applicable to 'those other five commonly called Sacraments,' namely, Penance, Confirmation, Orders, Matrimony, and Unction; certainly not to the three last-named. With 'those other five' we are not concerned in this article. The retention by the Reformers of the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper was due not only to the clear and vivid witness borne by those Sacraments to the fundamental truths of the gospel, but also to the belief that they were instituted by the Lord Himself.

But if it is a primary question whether Christ instituted the Christian Church and the two great Christian Sacraments, it is perhaps not a cardinal question. The validity of those institutions, at any rate, does not appear to be bound up with it. Yet it must be acknowledged that to take away the Dominical institution would be to impair for many minds the value of the Church and of its ordinances of Baptism and the Lord's Supper. We have been assured that in Catholic belief there is a 'tenacious mutual connexion and cohesion' between the ideas of Dominical institution and the 'general necessity' of the Sacraments for salvation.

Let us look for a little at this question of our Lord's relationship to Church and Sacraments. In the first place, there appears to be good reason for maintaining that He intended to found, and did actually found, a Church or fellowship of the redeemed. It is not merely that He uses the term church (ecclesia) in two sayings (Mt 16^{18} 18^{17}) which may after all be authentic and which imply such an intention and purpose, but the founding and building of a Church was essential to the establishment of the Kingdom of God on earth. Whether He expected the speedy consummation of the Kingdom or not, the idea of the Church is intimately connected with that of the imminence of the advent of the Kingdom. And, in fact, as Dr. N. Micklem has well expressed it, the Church, as the fellowship of those who have been 'translated out of darkness into the kingdom of his dear Son,' is the direct result of the mighty act of God which Christ announced. On the other hand, while we may confidently affirm that our Lord founded a Church, we must not affirm that it was the Christian Church as we see it in history, in all its varieties of doctrine, worship, and government. Nor can even the Catholic claim be allowed that there is one true form of Church doctrine, worship, and government deriving from the institution of Christ Himself.

Again, there appears to be good reason for maintaining that our Lord instituted, in the sense of sanctioned and enjoined, the Sacrament of Baptism. The chief warrant for the celebration (Mt 28^{18-20}), as being based on a post-Resurrection saying, may

offer difficulty. But it is at least a reminder that Baptism was practised in the very beginnings of the Christian Church. (The Trinitarian phrase, in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, has probably supplanted in the original text the phrase, in or into the name of Christ.) And the belief of the early Christians that this rite was instituted by Christ Himself, and is not a mere perpetuation of Jewish proselyte-baptism, is one that should not be lightly challenged.

As for the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, here again there appears to be good reason for maintaining the Dominical institution, in the sense that our Lord performed certain actions at the Feast in the Upper Room with the intention that they should be repeated, and that the repetition of them is not a mere perpetuation, say, of the Jewish *Kiddush*. The warrant in this case is to be found in a pre-Resurrection saying of Christ, which is recorded not only in the Synoptic Gospels (Mt 26^{26-29}, Mk 14^{22-25}, Lk 22^{14-20}) but in one of the earliest documents of the New Testament (1 Co 11^{23-26}). Opinions may, however, differ in this case, even more than in the case of Baptism, as to the original meaning of the institution and as to the influences that shaped the Pauline interpretation.

Which brings us to the more positive treatment of our subject.

As it is not so much the doctrine of the Church in itself that we want to state here as the doctrine of the Church in relation to the Sacraments, let us begin with the distinction, latent in what has been previously said, between the Church visible and the Church invisible. This distinction has been a commonplace in Protestant theology since Calvin, and is not unrecognized in Roman Catholic theology. By the Church visible was meant the outward ecclesiastical communion with its faults and blemishes; by the Church invisible the company of the elect, of those foreordained to salvation, whether here on earth or in the heavenly world. The tendency in Protestant theology is, however, towards a more Biblical and less dogmatic view of the invisible Church, which is regarded as the spiritual community of all Christian believers.

Another way of expressing the essential distinction which was in Calvin's mind is through the contrast between faith and order (if the latter term be not understood in a technical sense). By the Church of faith is understood the aforesaid spiritual community or society of believers; by the Church of order is understood the formal organization or organizations by means of which the spiritual society seeks for itself modes of expression. It is of the nature of spiritual entities to express themselves in outward and visible forms.

To the visible Church, or the Church of order, or the organized Church (as it may also be phrased), we owe the Scriptures, especially the Scriptures of the New Testament, our primary source and standard of Christian doctrine. To it also we owe our dogmas, creeds, and confessions, a secondary source and standard—on Protestant principles, emphatically a secondary source and standard—of Christian doctrine. Through its offices and ordinances also, and through its evangelistic agencies and activities, the organized Church seeks and finds for itself further modes of expression.

Now it is as ordinances of worship attaching to the organized Church that the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper are primarily conceived. As such they are solemn *forms*, neither more nor less.

Baptism, considered only as a religious form, is the rite or ceremony of admission into the visible or organized Church; and an admission ceremony is one of the most obvious forms in which the life of any organized society or community can express itself, with a view to showing its distinctiveness in the world of human life.

Again, the Lord's Supper, considered only as a religious form, is a rite or ceremony of fellowship within the visible or organized Church; and a rite of fellowship is also one of the most obvious forms in which the life of any organized society or community can express itself, with a view to showing its corporate unity in the world of human life. Said James Martineau: 'To decline this venerable usage is virtually to insulate oneself in Christendom.'

The Lord's Supper expresses more than the corporate unity of the worshipping congregation. It expresses also the corporate unity, the communion and fellowship, of all who name the name of Christ, wherever they may dwell, and however they may differ from one another in creed or liturgy. As being partakers together of 'that one bread,' Christians are united in one great fellowship, belong to one great brotherhood.

Let us pause for a moment to notice how strangely different is the attitude of the Christian Churches towards these two great ceremonial forms of the Christian society, that of admission and that of fellowship or unity. Both forms are almost universally observed. But while Baptism, as administered by any one body of Christians, is recognized by every other body as valid (except that Baptists only admit the validity of 'Believers'

Baptism'), the Lord's Supper—here is the strange difference of attitude—has actually become a form of exclusion with Christendom, setting up barriers between the Churches. Yet there are many signs of the breaking down of this old exclusivism, and we may dare to look for a time when the Lord's Supper shall more truly express the fellowship and corporate unity for which it primarily stands.

The present writer likes to recall how at the Life and Work Conference held at Stockholm in 1925 he sat at the Lord's Table with Lutherans and Anglicans, Methodists, Congregationalists, and others, not to speak of fellow-Presbyterians of many varieties.

So far the formal meanings of the two 'Sacraments of the Gospel,' are rites or ceremonies attaching to the Church of order. Consider now their deeper and more spiritual meanings. Let us observe in the first instance that Baptism and the Lord's Supper are, both of them, more than solemn forms; they are sacred *symbols*.

A symbol may be defined as the outward and visible sign or emblem of something inward and spiritual. Even in this limited sense symbol plays a large part in ordinary life. To shake hands, to raise one's hat, to salute our country's flag, to put on mourning, are all symbolic acts—though we may not be aware in each case of their significance. In religion also symbol plays a large part, especially in religious art. Thus, as we are told, in the art of the Catacombs the following symbolic representations are found: the dove sipping water from a basin or jar (which is the soul refreshing itself from the water of life); the anchor (which is the hope, sure and steadfast, which enters in behind the veil); the ship and the lighthouse (which typify the dangerous voyage across the ocean of life to the haven of safety).

But besides symbolic representation through art there is also in religion, as in ordinary life, symbolic representation by means of action, as in the ordinances of Baptism and the Lord's Supper. Notice how simple and natural the symbolism is which is here employed. The signs or emblems are the elements of water and of bread and wine, and the actions are those of washing and of eating and drinking.

It may be asked, What is the use and value of symbols? The answer may be given, They tend to preserve that inward and spiritual thing of which, according to our definition, they are the outward and visible signs. That is certainly true of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, which are not 'naked and bare signs.' It would be difficult to overestimate the influence of their respective symbolisms in the diffusion of our Christian religion. No doubt George Fox and the Quakers got on very well without symbol or form (unless we take account here of dress and speech), but Quakerism is not a tree of extensive growth. It appears to be the verdict of history that the embodiment of spiritual ideas in symbolic acts makes for their permanence, helps to fix and even enhance them.

As a sacred symbol Baptism speaks to us through the outward and visible sign of water of purity, moral and spiritual purity. It tells us of the washing away of the stains of sin which follows upon repentance, according to the gospel, and of the new life of faith and obedience to which we are called in Christ. In other words, it is a symbol of the divine grace in forgiveness and regeneration. Inward purity, then—of this, Baptism is a significant symbol; and as being a significant symbol, it tends to perpetuate the idea which it conveys.

Again, as a sacred symbol the Lord's Supper speaks to us through the outward and visible signs of bread and wine of strength, moral and spiritual strength. It tells us of that spiritual eating of Christ's flesh and drinking of His blood, that spiritual communion with Him, which sustains, nourishes, and strengthens those who have entered upon the new life of Christian faith and obedience—that spiritual eating of His flesh and drinking of His blood which for Christian believers may even be experienced in ordinary life. And not only has the symbolism of the Lord's Supper a deep moral and spiritual meaning, namely, inward strength; it tends also, merely as symbolism, to perpetuate that meaning, to keep it in our minds and to send it down the years.

Thus we may say that inward purity and inward strength are the two ideas suggested and conserved by the respective symbolisms of the two great Sacraments. But it would appear that there is yet more to be said. As many of us believe, the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper are more than forms, however solemn, and more even than symbols, however sacred.

Take first the ordinance of Baptism. It is more than the form of entrance into the organized Church; more than a symbol, simple and precious, of moral and spiritual purity through Christ. Even words tend to produce the ideas of which they are the signs, and there is ground for holding that such a solemn and sacred act as Baptism tends to produce the spiritual reality which it represents in symbol. That is to say, Baptism may be an actual channel of spiritual influence. It may be a

Sacramental act in the full sense of the term. It may be, in the old historic phrase, a veritable *means of grace*. In a Christian Sacrament the inward and spiritual grace, of which the symbolic media employed are outward and visible signs, is not only 'represented' (as is the language of the Westminster Confession and Catechisms) but 'sealed and applied' to believers.

This is readily recognized to be possibly or probably true in the case of those whose Baptism takes place in a time of spiritual crisis and fresh consecration. Such conditions were normal among the early converts to Christianity, and they are still normal on the mission field. But let us ask, even at the risk of raising a controversial issue, What of the case of infants? Are we justified in speaking of the ordinance of Baptism as in their case a means of grace? The truth would seem to be that in their case the value or efficacy of the Sacrament depends even more largely than in the case of adults upon the action of the Church or Christian community. We should think of the infant not only as received into the Church by Baptism, but also as to be educated in the days to come in the Christian faith and obedience, to be brought up by parent and teacher in the knowledge and love of Christ and surrounded in home and school by the example and influence of Christian lives. Apart from the obligation thus devolving upon the Christian community it is difficult to see how the baptism of infants, as distinguished from the baptism of adult believers, can be anything more than a form and symbol. One understands the protest of the Anabaptists that the ceremony of infant baptism is but 'meaningless magic.' The true justification of the practice of infant baptism appears to lie in the recognition of the moral and spiritual influence which believing parents and the believing community exercise under God upon the minds and lives of the children. It rests with the Church, so to speak, to convert the ordinance of Baptism, when administered to infants, into a Sacramental means of grace.

Undoubtedly something has been lost through the all but universal substitution of the practice of infant baptism, valuable as it may be in itself, for that of adult baptism. There should be some solemn and sacred rite to signalize the time of conscious self-dedication to Christ and His Church. But what has been lost is largely recovered again when the Church makes First Admission to the Lord's Table an occasion for the public ratification and confirmation of baptismal vows. This the Reformed and Presbyterian Churches are doing more and more; and in this they are so far coming into line with the Greek, Roman, Anglican, and Lutheran Churches, which while practising infant baptism maintain also the rite or ceremony of Confirmation. It might be noted that Calvin wished to revise and retain the rite of Confirmation, which was observed in the Early Church, and that the Scottish Commissioners tried to persuade the Westminster Assembly to recognize a rite similar to Confirmation for the solemn admission of catechumens to the Lord's Table.

Again, consider the ordinance of the Lord's Supper. It is more than the form of fellowship within the organized Church; more than a symbol, also simple and precious, of moral and spiritual strength through Christ. Even words—let it be repeated—tend to produce the ideas of which they are the signs, and there is also ground for holding that such a solemn and sacred act as the Lord's Supper tends to produce the spiritual reality which it represents in symbol. That is to say, the Lord's Supper possesses the crowning quality of a Sacrament, as being an actual channel of spiritual influence, a veritable means of grace.

This is said in no magical or merely mystical sense. As the worshipper submits himself in faith and humility to the associations and memories of the Sacred Feast, heavenly influences encircle him, heavenly presences become real to him, the living Spirit of Christ is impressed upon his spirit, and he rises from the Holy Table renewed and strengthened in soul, prepared to meet the temptations of our common life more bravely and to endure its inevitable discipline more steadfastly, and above all—out of a deepened sense of our human brotherhood in Christ—prepared to live more for the good of others, as a true follower of Him who left the Upper Room to take upon Him the burden of the Cross and to give His life a ransom for many.

Such then are the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper: as forms, declaring the distinctness and the unity respectively of the Christian Church; as symbols, 'representing' the ideas of inward purity and inward strength respectively; as means of grace, 'sealing and applying' those moral and spiritual qualities to the souls of believers.

It is not (and this is said from the Evangelical Protestant standpoint) that in the Sacraments, and there only, we may experience the purifying influence of Christ and the strengthening effects of communion with Him. These are spiritual experiences, and are not necessarily bound up with any symbolic form, however significant. But yet it is

through the Sacraments that the appropriate symbolism is provided by which the ideas of inward purity and inward strength (in older terms, of the divine grace in justification and the divine grace in sanctification) are most vividly conveyed, and by means of which, as we may well believe, they may be most truly realized. As St. Augustine said, the Sacraments are *verbum visibile*, the visible gospel, and there is a unique and moving eloquence in those expressive symbols.

Literature.

REVELATION ICONOGRAPHY.

Scholars of the University of Chicago are seeking to build up a Byzantine corpus of New Testament iconography. Two works had already appeared before the work under review. These were 'The Rockefeller McCormick New Testament' in three volumes (a reproduction in colour facsimile, with history and critical commentary, of a thirteenth-century manuscript—the most lavishly illuminated Greek New Testament known to exist), and 'The Four Gospels of Karahissar' in two volumes (a study of a thirteenth-century codex of the Four Gospels in Greek, illustrated by sixty-five miniatures and introduced by seven decorative arcades). From the University of Chicago Press there has now also come another sumptuous work, in two volumes, *The Elizabeth Day McCormick Apocalypse* (volume I. £6 net, volume II, £2 5s. net; set of two volumes £7 10s. net). The publishers in Great Britain and Ireland are the Cambridge University Press.

The first volume, which is edited by Mr. Harold R. Willoughby, Associate Professor of New Testament Literature in the University of Chicago, reproduces in facsimile the complete cycle of sixty-nine early-seventeenth-century miniatures illustrating the Revelation of John to be found in the Elizabeth Day McCormick Apocalypse manuscript. No other Greek manuscript of the Apocalypse is known to exist with a series of text illustrations. One would have thought the Apocalypse a tempting book for the illustrator, but it was long before the canonicity of the Apocalypse was admitted by the Greek Church.

These miniatures incorporate a wide range of foreign motifs borrowed from Islamic, Slavonic, and occidental art—chiefly Persian, Turkish, Russian, Italian, and German. In this goodly first volume Mr. Willoughby expounds the iconography of the miniatures *seriatim* as well as describes the McCormick codex and discusses generally the McCormick cycle of Apocalypse scenes.

The second volume, which is edited by Mr. Ernest Cadman Colwell, Chairman of the Department of New Testament and Early Christian History in the University of Chicago, who gave an account in the first volume of the history and the content of the codex, gives the text of the codex, which is a translation of the Apocalypse into the common Greek idiom of the sixteenth-seventeenth century; at the same time it seeks to reconstruct the history of the Elizabeth Day McCormick Apocalypse and thus to make some contribution to the study of seventeenth-century versions of the Greek New Testament.

For the translation into vernacular Greek of the commentary, as well as of the Apocalypse, Maximos the Peloponnesian appears to have been responsible. He is described to us as 'a very industrious and somewhat roving minor ecclesiastic of the Orthodox Church, not uninteresting and considerably capable.' Making translations of this sort into the *koinê* of the sixteenth-seventeenth century is said to have been one of the major activities of his busy life. He does not, however, excel as a translator on the side of accuracy or careful workmanship.

Could we spare the space, we should gladly enlarge upon the uniqueness and the value of the Maximos cycle of Apocalypse miniatures and upon the admirable learning and industry which the editors of this work display. As it is, we must be content with quoting the following sentences from Mr. Colwell as a sort of postscript: 'The most complete contrast to Byzantine nonconcern with the Revelation of John was presented by the great upsurge of late-Greek interest in this book in the immediately post-Byzantine era. Once the Apocalypse was orthodoxly accepted as scripture, once the Greeks under Turkish rule found themselves in a social and political position comparable to that of the early Christians under Roman rule, their attitude toward the Revelation of John changed entirely. Late-Greek interest in the Christian Apocalypse suddenly became as keen and vivacious as it had earlier been dull.'

PROFESSOR COLLINGWOOD ON METAPHYSICS.

This book—*An Essay on Metaphysics*, by Professor R. G. Collingwood (Milford ; 18s. net)—was drafted on a voyage made by the writer in search of health. We hope that the compilation of so much penetration and cleverness did him something of the good that its perusal has done us. For it is decidedly a tonic. One must bear in mind that it does not profess to be a treatise on metaphysics, but just 'a book about metaphysics.' It passes shrewd criticisms on some current notions as to what metaphysics is and its futility. This, we think, is its value on the theoretical side. The author shows convincingly that without metaphysics there can be no science. But what is metaphysics concerned with? Its true task is to exhibit 'absolute presuppositions.' These are fundamental, whether one is conscious of it or not, to the science of any age. But the 'absolute presuppositions' of one age are not those of all ages. Science and civilization depend upon them, but they change and perish. Metaphysics can become a 'science' only in this way—by becoming historical.

Among suggested substitutes for metaphysics the author is specially and in the main rightly severe upon psychology. In the main we agree with him, but in his righteous wrath he becomes somewhat unfair. 'Trial and Error' among pet animals is, of course, not comparable to the deliberate employment of that method among men ; but every animal lover knows that his pet does learn something by a method which bears some analogy to 'trial and error,' and what else does Professor Collingwood suggest it can more happily be designated. Similarly, the writer must be well aware that exercise of a muscle leads to two seemingly contradictory things—greater facility of use, and fatigue. So is Professor Spearman's 'self-contradiction' so glaring after all? On the practical side the author solemnly warns against 'irrationalism' which has been growing alarmingly. To his mind it is the subtle foe which is the greatest menace to European civilization. The essence of irrationalism is loss of all real interest in truth, and the substitution of mass-emotion for reasonable persuasion ; a being content to 'feel' and a declination to 'think.'

A CHALLENGE TO MODERNISM.

The Two Humanities, An Attempt at Christian Interpretation of History in the Light of the War, by Mr. D. R. Davies (James Clarke ; 7s. 6d. net). There has recently been a sudden and widespread revolt against the Humanism that had been steadily gathering momentum during the last five centuries. It is not necessary to mention again the sources of that supreme self-confidence which his achievements created in modern man. That has been done over and over again in recent books. And in these books we have been led back to a belief in the necessity of the divine initiative for any reasonable hope of salvation for our modern world. In this matter there are many who join hands with Barth in his emphasis on the sovereignty of God who are by no means prepared to follow him in his view of man or of history.

Mr. Davies is not a Barthian, but no one could possibly exceed him in his contempt for human nature. In his previous work, 'On to Orthodoxy,' he gives an account of his spiritual pilgrimage. It began with Socialism and its optimistic belief in inevitable progress. The war of 1914 shattered this faith for him, and with it the religious Liberalism which was associated with it. Thereafter he passed through many phases, shedding many 'isms' (including Pacifism and Marxism) till he arrived at what he calls 'Orthodoxy.' And his new book may be regarded as a further exposition of this final creed.

It begins with a pessimistic view of man. What the present war has shown is, first, the complete futility of the modern idea of progress, and secondly, the radical evil and irrationality of man. This evil is due to man's freedom, and Mr. Davies accepts the doctrine of the Fall. But it is not a fall in time. The Fall took place in a pre-existent state. Mr. Davies is driven to this by his honest acceptance of evolution. The earliest type of 'Man' in history was incapable of a fall. The fall that took place was from full personality to a kind of undeveloped consciousness, and it is in this inchoate state that historic man begins. Our salvation, therefore, is a recovery of the original personality which we lost by the Fall. History is the working out of the consequences of the Fall. In itself, and by itself (*i.e.* apart from God) history is the realm of death, of disintegration and futility. The Modernist version of man leaves the realist no alternative but sheer, absolute despair.

But this despair is the condition of our salvation. Christ, 'the Re-Creator,' came to make a new humanity. Salvation is the absorption of the old humanity into the new. It is a little difficult to follow the course of events at this point. We are redeemed in the mass, as it were, but one by one all the same. Yet the religious decision that would

effect our salvation is quite beyond us. We are incapable of this act of will. It is God's act. But, though we cannot accept the salvation, we can enter a zone, a spiritual region in which the transaction can take place. We do so first, by a realization of our own utter powerlessness, and, secondly, by a belief that God is able to do what we cannot. Then God acts. He only needs these two conditions. When they are fulfilled we are brought into that solidarity with God in the new humanity created by Christ. The fundamental pre-condition is utter despair. In this dark world we need a fellowship of repentance. Then the dawn will appear.

From this brief sketch of an elaborate and sustained argument it will probably seem to many readers that there is a confusion of thought in the working out of the 'scheme of salvation.' Nor will the excessive pessimism of the writer's view of man be acceptable. But this is a serious book, containing vigorous thinking expressed in a style that constantly reflects the fierce earnestness of the author. Some of its ideas (such as the process by which Christ arrived at the consciousness of His own divinity) are original, even when they are not convincing. If you look at the book as a whole and modify the exaggerations of what are undoubted truths, you will receive the impression of a mind, strong, vigorous, and deeply religious, at work, in its own way and with its own vision, upon the great essentials of the gospel. It is decidedly a book worth reading and with a definite message for our time.

THE PSYCHO-PHYSICAL PROBLEM.

The Idea of the Soul in Western Philosophy and Science (Allen & Unwin; 12s. 6d. net) is an able and learned historical essay by the Lecturer in Experimental Zoology in Liverpool University, William Ellis, Ph.D. Believing that the unifying thread running through the history of European culture, whether in its religious, philosophical, or scientific aspect, is the evolution of the Greek idea of the soul, he seeks to tell the story of that evolution. He begins with the idea of the soul in primitive thought and ancient Greek cults, and traces it through the physical philosophers of Greece, through Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle, and so through early Christian thought right down to modern times.

He has made good use throughout of authoritative writers, but the essay also bears the impress of his own vigorous and logical mind. The latter part of it, in which he treats of the conditioned reflex, behaviourism, the Drieschian entelechy, and other more scientific aspects of the subject, is the stronger and more independent part. It is also the more valuable.

Two points of formal criticism we would make. The first is that the writer never appears to be able to leave the ancient world behind him; with the result that his essay shows a certain redundancy in exposition. The second is that the book contains many linguistic inaccuracies; in particular, the Greek words used are sometimes mis-spelled, unaccented, or wrongly accented.

We note with interest that the writer appears to be attracted by the metaphysical aspect of his theme, and that his spiritual hierarchy of animation, life, consciousness, and self-consciousness leads him to adumbrate a pampsychist hypothesis of the world on Leibnizian lines. There is room for a new exposition of the pampsychist hypothesis; science has made many contributions since James Ward and C. A. Richardson wrote. And Dr. Ellis is so far qualified to give us such an exposition, not only because of his scientific attainments, but also because of his philosophical conviction as to the limitations of the mechanical view of life.

The Spirit of Man and the Spirit of God (Blackwell; 2s. net) consists of three sermons preached before the University of Oxford by the Right Rev. J. W. Hunkin, D.D., M.C., Bishop of Truro. He is convinced that fresh examination is needed of that part of Christian theology which is covered by the title of his volume. His first section shows the development of the doctrine of spirit and Spirit from the Old Testament to the New, the second from the beginning of the Christian era to the present day, while the third deals with the present-day situation and appears to be a plea for the recognition of the mystical element in religion. If this is the main point of the discussion it is not very clearly made; indeed, it is apt to be missed by reason of the author's large indulgence in quotation from other writers. The author has read widely in the subject, and brings his readers into touch with much of the best recent literature upon it.

It is not easy to be scholarly and technical about an obscure problem, and at the same time fascinating, but this has been achieved by Dr. Philip Carrington, who is M.A.(Cantab.), Lit.D. (N.Z., which is presumably New Zealand), Hon.

S.T.D. and Hon. D.C.L., and Bishop of Quebec. His book is *The Primitive Christian Catechism; A Study in the Epistles* (Cambridge University Press; 7s. 6d. net). The idea is that a good deal of what may be called Catechetical material in the Epistles is of the same pattern as Jewish material which formed a Jewish Catechism. The same themes, in the same order and often in the same words, are to be found in both. The passages occur in Ephesians, Colossians, 1 Peter, and James, and really form a primitive Christian Catechism which continues the tradition in the Jewish community. Among other matters on which this throws light is the source of passages in 1 Peter, which have often been regarded as borrowings from the Pauline Letters. Dr. Carrington contends that in both cases (Peter and Paul) the passages in question are simply primitive Christian catechetical matter in traditional Jewish forms. The whole investigation is extraordinarily interesting, and, though some of the points are not worked out in full, sufficient evidence is given to show that Bishop Carrington has a sound case. It is a thorough piece of work, and adds a new element of value to New Testament scholarship.

A very interesting little book on the metrical psalms has been published with an unusual object. It is *The Scottish Metrical Psalter (1650), a Revision*, by Mr. Nichol Grieve, M.A. (T. & T. Clark; 2s. net). Mr. Grieve makes many strictures on the metrical psalter with which most people will heartily agree. Indeed, they could not but agree. He mentions defective rhymes, broken lines, confusion in personal pronouns, crude metaphors, unchristian sentiments, obsolete terms, elisions and inversions, to which formidable list may be added grotesquely unpoetic verse. It is a modest claim that some revision is advisable. It is true that there are not a few examples of real poetry, like the hundredth psalm, the hundred and twenty-first, the twenty-third, and others. But a good deal of the metrical psalter is unsingable. And Mr. Grieve here gives us a creditable revision, on the following lines: First, only those portions that are suitable for Christian worship are included. Secondly, emendations have been made in some, to make them suitable. Thirdly, the familiar and beloved are left untouched. Fourthly, additional versions in other metres have been provided. This revision is frankly an experiment, but on a first reading it seems to be a fairly successful one, and in any case it may pave the way to a careful official revision later.

What Christ Achieved and Taught, by Mr. Sidney G. Peill, M.B., Ch.B. (James Clarke; 1s. net), is described in the sub-title as 'A Short New Testament Summary (in Metrical Paraphrase) with Notes on Modern Difficulties.' It is done in blank verse in the Miltonic style, and gives an account of Christ's teaching and of His saving work. The explanatory notes are printed as prose, but the same rhythm runs through the whole and tends to become monotonous. The book is to be commended for its loyalty to the gospel story, its sound Christian teaching, its frequent felicities of language, and the warmth of its devotional spirit.

Lamps in the Wind, by Dr. Eleanor McDougall (Edinburgh House Press; 2s. 6d. net), gives a charming account of South Indian women and their problems. The writer, who has recently retired from the Principalship of the Madras Women's Christian College, writes with an unusual degree of mellow wisdom and sympathy. She has gained a deep insight into the mentality of Indian girls, has loved them and devoted a lifetime to the study of their problems. It is fascinating and critical work this of pouring new wine into old bottles. Humorous touches are not wanting of English words and idioms whimsically misunderstood, of slavish memory work like that of the senior student who, though well aware of who Apollo and Luther were, could yet write that the Epistle to the Hebrews was written by either one or other of them, owing to a confused recollection of a sentence which said that Luther had suggested that *Apollos* was the author. This little book, so vivid and picturesque, so kindly and revealing, is a rare delight to read.

Christ and His Christians, edited by Mr. R. Walter Hull (Epworth Press; 6s. net), is described as 'a symposium,' but this does not mean that the numerous contributors met in one place. It means that Mr. Hull obtained contributions from distinguished persons, and arranged them in sections —Christ, The Church, His Christians. The writers (they are really speakers, for it is obvious that many of the essays were delivered to an audience) are really distinguished. Under the first head, for example, we have Dr. Fosdick, Principal David Cairns, Professor J. A. Findlay, and Mr. H. V. Morton—a goodly quartette. Other well-known writers are Dr. J. D. Jones, Dr. Sloane Coffin, Dr. Lynn Hough, the late Dr. B. H. Streeter, and the Rev. Rhondda Williams. Among the subjects discussed are The Centrality of Christ, Worship,

Sublimation, The Church's Need for 'Plus' Men, Creative Prayer, What is Right with the Churches? It is only necessary to add that, with such subjects and such writers, a book could hardly fail to be rewarding.

It has been said of the average collections of addresses to children that they are—just average. This would not apply to *One Year's Talks to Children*, by the Rev. Edgar P. Dickie, Professor of Divinity in St. Mary's College, University of St. Andrews (Hodder & Stoughton; 3s. 6d. net). It is startling to find a divinity professor in an ancient university writing, and even publishing, addresses to children. It makes us suspect that he is almost human. And a further surprise is that these addresses are so good. They are clever, original, brief, amusing, and evangelical. There might, perhaps, with advantage be more of the last of these qualities. Most published children's sermons leave us wondering whether their authors ever preach the gospel to children. The present series does not lack this element. There are sermons for Palm Sunday, Easter, Christmas (Good Friday gets a miss), and there is a Christian attitude everywhere. In short, this collection is above the average, and might well serve as a model.

The Christian Heritage, edited by Canon E. Basil Redlich (Methuen; 6s. net), is, as the sub-title declares, 'An Anthology for Our Times.' It is arranged in fifty-two chapters which follow as closely as may be the succession of the Christian year. Each chapter is devoted to a single topic, which is generally treated in a fourfold way, namely, by a passage from Scripture, a prose quotation, a poem, and a prayer. There is a rich variety in the topics, and the range of quotation is very wide indeed. For example, in the first chapter which treats of God, we have quotations from Professor H. R. Mackintosh, Dean Inge, Dr. Walter C. Smith, and St. Anselm. In the second chapter, the topic of which is 'The Mind of the Universe,' we have quotations from Bishop Gore, Sir A. S. Eddington, Addison, and Walter Rauschenbusch. This will give some idea of the abundance of material gathered together in this book and arranged with care. It is suited for private reading and meditation, but it should prove a valuable guide and storehouse of material for a year of sermons.

We are glad to see that despite war conditions publication of Mr. W. E. Vine's *Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words* is being carried on. The third volume, *Lo–Ser* (Oliphants; 10s. 6d. net) is now in our hands. It maintains the high standard of its predecessors.

A Penguin special gives *The Case for Federal Union*, by Mr. W. B. Curry (6d.). To those who have read Mr. Streit's 'Union Now,' or who have followed intelligently recent discussions on the question, there is little new in this book. But it is well that the arguments should be made available for the public in this form. The writer feels that his case is 'unanswerable,' but many will have serious doubts on that score. The balance of Europe has changed even since this book was written, and the difficulties have become more mountainous. The Federation is, of course, to be democratic in theory, but the writer's curt remark that 'small nations, struggling to establish silly little republics . . . have no claim upon liberal sympathies' is one that Hitler would cordially approve, and suggests that the Federation might become the most gigantic tyranny the world has ever seen. It should not be forgotten that Russia and Germany are federations of a kind. The light-hearted optimism with which it is here suggested that India, excluded in the meantime from the Federation, would speedily solve its own problem if left alone, is not serious and responsible thinking. But we welcome this book because the whole question is so vast and the world's need so great that men's minds everywhere must be incited to thought and action.

A very beautiful book of Bible stories for children is *The New Testament for the Children: Book III, Stories of Jesus* (3), by Walter and Hugh Kendrick, illustrated by Elsie Anna Wood (Sheldon Press; 2s. net). The stories are well told, adhering for the most part to the original tales. In the few cases in which the authors have allowed themselves to exercise their imagination (only three in number) they are carefully marked. It is refreshing to find story-tellers who do not soar out of touch with the Bible altogether. Special mention should be made of the illustrations which are admirably drawn and really illustrative. The paper, printing, and make-up of the book are alike admirable.

The Archbishop of Canterbury in 1937 appointed a Commission 'to consider the subject of the impediments to marriage constituted by certain relationships of consanguinity and affinity.' The Commission was a strong one scientifically, ecclesi-

astically, and psychologically, and it reported in September of last year. Its findings have just been published in a bulky pamphlet under the title, *Kindred and Affinity as Impediments to Marriage* (S.P.C.K.; 2s. 6d. net). Years ago in every church in England there could be seen a large notice which began: 'A man may not marry his grandmother.' But the problem is not so easy as that, and time and common sense and legislation have united to throw doubt upon some of the items in Archbishop Parker's Table of Affinities which has hitherto been accepted as authoritative. The Commission has heard exhaustive evidence, has asked authorities, like Professor J. B. S. Haldane, for statements on one side of the problem and another, and now issues its findings, with a new Table recommended for use in the Church of England (p. 90). The findings are very cautious, much more so than probably they ought to be. It may easily be felt that after such a long period of gestation the Commission might have come out boldly and said, 'This kind of marriage (with a deceased wife's sister, for example) is perfectly legitimate.' It seems such a waste of time, in view of the modern view of the progressiveness of revelation, to discuss whether the prohibitions in Leviticus are binding on us to-day. However, the members of this body have made a genuinely thorough investigation, and their conclusions will be read with interest in all the churches.

God's Ultimate, by Mr. A. E. Saxby (Stockwell; 2s. 6d. net), is a forceful argument in favour of universalism. There is, of course, much to be said for that doctrine, but the present writer is altogether too prone to a hard dogmatism. His argument is elaborately exegetical, but when he assumes that his particular rendering of a text or New Testament word is 'God's meaning' one feels that he oversteps the line. Surely every thoughtful person, not to say devout Christian, must humbly realize that the whole field of the eternal world is too utterly mysterious to be surveyed with assurance, but here all is measured and laid out as neat as a tennis court. St. Paul confessed that God's judgments are unsearchable, but this author claims to have searched them out. His earnestness is admirable but it is impossible to accept his pronouncements with confidence.

Reading the most recent book by the Rev. James Reid, D.D., *Facing Life with Christ* (S.C.M.; 5s. net), one can easily understand his great reputation as a preacher. These discourses are rich in experience of life. They are the work of a man who understands people, average people with common problems, and their purpose is to help such people to face their problems with assurance and courage. He speaks of fear, anxiety, frustration, suffering, the right use of possessions, the right conduct of personal relationships, and in all these matters of the way to liberty and peace and power through fellowship with Christ. He is an interpreter of life in the light thrown on it by the Cross and victory of Christ. The whole book is the work of a competent, cultured, well-read, devout Christian minister. Its issue will be comfort, in the real sense of the word, a fortifying illumination which has first of all come to the author himself, and which he transmits with confidence to his fellow-pilgrims.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Bread and ——?

By the Reverend Stuart Robertson, M.A., Lisbon.

'Man shall not live by bread alone.'—Mt 4[4].

'Bread,' said a small boy, 'is what you put something on.' A very sound remark! Bread is a necessity of life, and therefore, whatever is dear, bread must be cheap so as to be within the reach of the very poorest. We can do without chocolates and cakes and meringues; they are nice, but not necessary. Bread is necessary and we can't do without it; therefore Jesus set it right in the centre of the Lord's Prayer and bade us pray for 'our daily bread.'

But bread alone is but dull feeding. It is, in fact, 'dry' bread; and dry bread and water is a prison sentence. It wants something on it: bread and butter for your first piece, if you have been properly brought up. Then bread and jam, or bread and

syrup, or bread and honey, or bread and butter and 'hundreds and thousands'—but always bread and *something on it.*

Now, what the little boy said, Jesus said long ago. 'Man,' He said, 'does not live by bread alone.' By bread alone he exists, but existence is not life. Bread feeds the body, but man is body and soul, and because both must be fed if we are really and completely to live, Jesus said, 'Not by bread alone but by every word that proceedeth from the mouth of God.' That was Jesus' recipe for life—'Bread and the word of God.' That was how He Himself lived and He was the Lord of life; and when He gave bread He never gave bread alone, but always bread and *something with it.*

He once fed five thousand people with bread and He had only five loaves to do it with. How did He do it? 'Oh,' you say, 'it was a miracle.' Yes; but what was the power that made five loaves go so far? I think it is told us in the beginning of the story: 'He had compassion on the multitude.' The disciples had not. They said, 'Send them away to buy bread.' Jesus said, 'You give them something to eat.' They replied, 'We can't, we have only five loaves.' But it was not shortage of loaves, it was shortage of pity that made them unable to do anything. Jesus loved the people, and because He loved them He was sorry for them.

Love is a wonderful multiplier! The little gift a child has made for her mother's birthday may be cheap stuff and clumsily cobbled; but because it is born of love and comes from love it is more precious to the mother than a costly gift from one who doesn't care. Bread given without compassion is very dry bread; it feeds the body and leaves the heart hungry. A very plain meal with friends round the table is a feast. The real banquet is friendship. Families are not brought up on bread alone, but on bread and love. Bread alone does not go very far, but bread with love goes very far indeed. With five loaves and without compassion the disciples could only have fed in a poor way some twenty people; Jesus gave His loving pity with the bread and it fed five thousand!

In the Upper Room, before He went to His cross, Jesus 'took bread' and gave to His disciples. Here, again, it was not 'bread alone.' 'This,' He said, 'is my body broken for you.' It was bread and with it, sacrifice. Sacrifice makes plain things precious. When David's warriors risked their lives to bring him water from the well of Bethlehem he felt the sacrifice made it too precious for him to drink. It wasn't any more just water; he said it was the blood of men and he offered it to God. In the song 'Caller Herrin'' the fishwife sings that it's not only fish she's selling; it's 'lives o' men.' And in the Upper Room Jesus gave the disciples bread, and it wasn't only bread; it was bread and *something with it,* and the something was sacrifice.

Once again, at Emmaus, on the evening of the first Easter day, He sat with His disciples. They didn't know who He was until 'He took bread and blessed it and broke it and gave it to them.' Then they knew; and once more it was not bread alone, but bread and *something with it,* and the something was what they wanted most of all, something their hearts hungered for, and that something was Himself. Still in the Sacrament of the Holy Table He gives us bread, and with it Himself.

Bread and ——? How you fill in the blank will make all the difference between existence and life.

Take Time by the Forelock.

By the Reverend P. Macpherson, M.A., Ladysmith, Natal.

'Now is the accepted time; now is the day of salvation.'—2 Co 6^2.

On the occasion of my last visit to Scotland I went to visit a ministerial friend in a parish in Banffshire, and, one day, I was strolling through the garden, admiring the flowers, and watching the bees at their work. There was something in that old-world garden which arrested my attention. It was an old sundial, and it had on it an inscription in Latin. The inscription consisted of four words—*Post Est Occasio Calva*—which mean: Opportunity is bald behind.

You know the saying about taking time by the forelock, the idea being that unless it is grasped by the forelock there is nothing else to lay hold of, for time, or opportunity, used to be represented by an old man completely bald at the back of his head. This is what was expressed in the inscription which I found on the old sundial—*Post Est Occasio Calva*—Opportunity is bald behind.

Now at the back of this statement there is a great wealth of experience, for this is what people have found to be the case in life. We all get our opportunities. They meet us on the road of life. If we seize them before they pass us by then we are all right; but if we delay, and let them go past, then we can never lay hold of them, for the only locks which opportunity has are on the front of its head. This is a great truth about our lives, and in the Bible, which is the best of all guide-books, this is what we always find. It is what is given in the text which I gave you—'Now is the accepted time;

now is the day of salvation.' The meaning of the text is the same as the inscription on the sundial.

Yet I am sure you have noticed that many people are apt to let opportunity slip and trust to the favourable time coming round again in the future. They are always putting off till to-morrow what they ought to do to-day. I spent a number of years in a country where this is one of the national characteristics. In South America they are great believers in waiting till to-morrow before doing what ought to be done to-day. In fact they are so much given to this habit that the commonest word in their language is the word for to-morrow. The Spanish for to-morrow is *mañana*, and they make use of it so often that South America has been very aptly called the Land of Mañana—the Land of To-morrow. This is a very bad habit, and I would warn you against it. There are several reasons why you should be on your guard against mañana.

One is that mañana—to-morrow—never comes, for it is always a day in front of you. To say that you will do a thing to-morrow is something like what you find when climbing a lofty hill. You see what looks like the summit, but when you reach it you find that the real top is still on ahead. It is also like what you see when on board a ship in mid-ocean when you look towards the horizon. From the deck of a ship the horizon is about seven miles away, but when you have gone seven miles the horizon is still seven miles farther on. That is just like to-morrow. It never really comes, for it is a will-o'-the-wisp which always eludes your pursuit. From this we can see how foolish it is to trust to to-morrow. The only safe time is to-day.

The Christian Year.

SEVENTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

No Going Back.

BY THE REVEREND JOHN HOWAT, B.D., BALLATER.

'No man, having put his hand to the plough, and looking back, is fit for the kingdom of God.'—Lk 9^{62}.

The miserable collapse of the French nation some months ago has led in this country to some pretty deep heart-searchings and questionings. We cannot now recall the passionate speeches of unswerving loyalty to the ideals of justice and liberty that emanated until quite recently from the French leaders and compare them with their still more recent actions without some feelings of bitterness. No man, having put his hand to the plough, and looking back! It took us so much by surprise that we ourselves have received a rude jolt in our easy-going confidence regarding the ultimate issue; and everyone has begun to suspect himself and his own loyalty and the strength of his spiritual resources. Can I depend on myself, or is it possible that my own collapse might come as swiftly and unexpectedly as that?

How often we find ourselves growing weary before the goal is reached! Jesus, who called men to a high and noble adventure, knew well the meaning of this spiritual peril in which we all stand to-day, however loud our protestations of allegiance. We think of His own life of steadfast endurance and loyalty to the things in which He passionately believed; and how He went on, true to the principles that He had established for Himself at the beginning of His ministry, even when the whole nation turned against Him and vented on Him their hatred and their spite and brought Him to His cross. There even at Golgotha, broken by physical suffering, in the utter loneliness of His rejection, when one by one His friends had betrayed Him or left Him, He stood fast and refused to compromise with the evil that sought His destruction. To such heights of loyal achievement we would give much to follow Him; and in all our weakness and frailty to-day it is only in His spirit and by His strength that we can hope to overcome.

In this path of high adventure there are three things we do well to notice. First, *we should be quite clear at the beginning what we are being called upon to do.* So often failure comes, because people have ignored or have not realized the difficulties at the outset. As we turn over the pages of the Gospels, we cannot help seeing how time and again Jesus discouraged people from undertaking discipleship. He doesn't receive everyone into the company of His friends on any terms. At first sight that may appear strange; for had He not come to be the Saviour of all men, irrespective of rank or nation or gifts? We usually think of Him welcoming everyone who turned towards Him, and spurning the proffered allegiance of none. But such a picture is entirely untrue to the facts. There is the man who comes to Him, feverishly shouting, 'Lord, I will follow thee whithersoever thou goest'; and Jesus reminds him quite frankly just what will be expected of him. 'Foxes have holes, and the birds of the air have nests; but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head.' Jesus with that uncanny gift for reading character knew the type of man

with which He was dealing, knew that he liked his comforts; and He is careful to forewarn him that in His company days of comfort and ease will be at an end. Then there is that other one who put his father's wishes before the leading of his conscience. 'He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me.' Then again there is the Rich Young Ruler, whose heart was set on his private possessions; Jesus knew His man better than he did himself, and bade him first sell all that he had and give to the poor. Jesus receives none of these people with open arms. He makes perfectly clear to them the implications of the step that they are contemplating.

And have we set ourselves deliberately to face that issue? Jesus knew, even while He listened to them, how valueless were the cheers of the crowd that thronged Him with their Hosannas. Have we entered upon this undertaking thoughtlessly, carelessly, or in the spirit of the gambler? For if we have, then at the hour of national testing, which is coming nearer and nearer to us, it will be in our soul that the weak link of the chain will be found. Wars have been paid for before by uncomfortable increases in taxation; by the sacrifice of members of the armed forces; by slight deviations from our normal routine. But that day has gone; the cost this time will be paid in rather a different coin. This is total war, and any day now we may be called upon to give everything. The French population learned that, but only when it was too late, and they broke under the strain. We must face that issue squarely and unflinchingly with clear eye and unclouded conscience, that when the moment comes, whatever shape or form the demand may take, we may not fail.

Second, *we must be careful to keep our goal constantly before our eyes.* We are bound to fail, if in the confusion and strain we lose sight of what we are trying to do. No man can plough his furrow who does not keep looking ahead. No helmsman can steer once he loses his course. We see our Lord at the outset of His ministry wrestling in the secrecy of His soul in the wilderness, as He determines the principles of His divine mission on earth. And throughout all the coming months and years nothing could shake Him—hatred, calumny, utter rejection—nothing that came to Him in all the turmoil of His struggle could undermine His fixed purpose or make Him withdraw from these. The angry hostility of the world beat in vain against His invincible heart of love. The temptation will come very often to us in the coming days of suffering, when all the might of our enemies descends upon us, to lose sight of the high purpose that we are seeking to accomplish, and to put something meaner and grosser in its place.

It is only by deliberately recalling ourselves to look fearlessly at our goal that we can prevent that happening; by pressing forward to the consummation of our dreams, and refusing to be blinded or deceived by the blows of experience or the plausible arguments of men. No man, having put his hand to the plough, can turn back. However much in these coming days we may long for the happy days of last summer, nothing we can do can bring us back there. France is beginning to learn that now. For her the fight is over; but she is not now where she was when she began. We must try to see that clearly, that however much we may look back, we cannot go back. That choice is not before us. Fight on to the end, or surrender—we can do either of these; but not go back. So let us see luminously clear the noble things for which we struggle, and pray that nothing that may come will distort our vision, or destroy the singleness of our purpose.

Lastly, and following from that, *there is need for a deep consecration of soul.* There can be no half-heartedness at any stage. Our aim is a high one; something towards which we must reach out with constant and never-relaxing effort. We shall meet much on this hard roadway that we have chosen that will persuade us to capitulate. Many an assault will be made on every resolution we have made. Do not let us then make the mistake of proudly trusting in our own strength. Braver and stronger men than we have already given way in this struggle; and we shall all need before long a strength that is greater than our own. Through all Christ's journey we see Him constantly relying on the divine resources of strength that came through perfect communion with His Heavenly Father. That was what brought Him through the agony of His Gethsemane to the victory of Calvary. These resources are ours also, if we seek them. God in our generation has called us to this task; and God can give to us also grace to uphold us in the evil day. We dare not neglect that aspect of the fight. If there is shameful capitulation, it will be because, first, there has been spiritual surrender. Only God can keep us from that; and in His companionship we can go forward, not light-heartedly, not stupidly boastful, but knowing the calm of His peace in the very din of battle, and the strength of His arm, being made perfect in our human weakness, so that nothing can daunt us or unnerve us till His victory is won.

EIGHTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Treasures of Darkness.

BY THE REVEREND RODERICK BETHUNE, M.A., ABERDEEN.

'And I will give thee the treasures of darkness.'—Is 45^{3}.

In a recent book Canon Peter Green records the conversation of a friend with whom, at the close of an evening service in the past winter, he made his way home. 'One thing this black-out business has done,' said his companion, 'it has given us back the stars. I,' he continued, 'used to be keen on studying the stars, and learning the names of the different constellations, when I was a boy. But since I went to work my holidays have always been in the summer when nights are too light for the stars to show well. And here in Salford I don't think I've seen the stars for five and twenty years. I suppose the glare of the city lights prevents our seeing them.'

The darkness enveloping our land last winter was symbolic of the experience through which we were and are passing. One after another the pleasures which provided life's brighter stretches have faded out until now we find ourselves encircled by a gloom which has invaded and affected even our very souls. An unmitigated disaster some are inclined to describe the experience, darkness with never a star to cheer us on our way. I wonder if that is correct? Is it not possible that as in the black-out many of us discovered or rediscovered the beauty of the stars, so in this admittedly difficult time, which has laid burdens upon so many shoulders, there are gleaming points of light which in happier circumstances we failed to see so clearly?

Long ago, when Cyrus, the chosen instrument of God, was setting out upon his appointed task, this was one promise made to him: 'I will give thee the treasures of darkness and the hidden riches of secret places.' Are the words applicable to our case to-day? We are passing through an experience as difficult as any our forebears were called to undergo. But it is my conviction that you and I and many more have discovered certain things through this very difficult experience which we overlooked when life was more happily circumstanced. What are some such things?

I. To begin with, we have discovered something about God.

If many of us were to be perfectly honest I think we should admit that, while in happier days we did not neglect the means of grace, a service in God's House then did not mean what a service there means to us now. Stories of men and women hard beset by circumstances and harried by relentless foes we found interesting within limits, but without any very intimate connexion with life as we lived it, with its gaiety, its enlightenment, and its achievement. Affirmations concerning God's governance of His world we found impressive, but their implications we did not stay to ponder. The gospel of Jesus Christ, while we endeavoured to respect its claims upon us, was not a matter of vital importance.

But how different it is to-day! When we enter God's House now it is with a deep consciousness of our need. When we listen to stories of men and women hard beset by circumstances and harried by relentless foes, it is with the interest of those who find themselves similarly placed and are possessed by a desire to know upon what, in their extremity, they can depend. When affirmations concerning God's governance are made in our hearing we ponder them carefully; while the gospel of Jesus Christ is welcomed as a message directed to our own times.

How true it is of many of us these days that we are discovering a substance in the promises of the gospel we had not suspected was there, a sustaining power in the faith once committed unto the Fathers which has carried us through days of increasing seriousness, a peace which really garrisons the mind which is genuinely stayed upon God. If the hour has been dark it has not been without its stars. If the experience has been difficult, it has not been without its compensations. Treasures have become ours in the darkness we did not possess before the darkness descended upon us. We have come to know God as we just didn't know Him before. We have discovered something about God.

II. We have discovered something about life.

The Old Testament records an experience which befell one of Israel's kings. He was overtaken by illness and gradually his strength ebbed from him until he lay at the very gates of death. As by a miracle, however, he rallied. The strength which had so steadily diminished as steadily returned until his wonted vigour was his once again. But the experience left its mark. 'By these things,' said Hezekiah referring to his illness, 'do men live.' Through his experience, in other words, he came to realize what life was all about. Despoiled of his accustomed health, helpless and dependent upon others, left to the company of his own thoughts, he had time and opportunity to think of his life as it had been and as it might have been, saw in their

proper perspective the things which had once seemed so important, realized the essential things and acknowledged his neglect of them.

Would it be too much to say that our experience has had the effect upon us that Hezekiah's experience had upon him? Many of us in recent days have seen our life as it has been and as it might have been, have seen in their proper perspective the things which once on a day were all important to us, have realized the essential things in life, the things which really count and which some of us have neglected. It is obvious to us all, surely, that most men are attacking life with a new seriousness and with an appreciation of things which are really vital. Let it not be said or thought, of course, that many of the activities in which we engaged in peaceful days were either harmful or unworthy; nor let it be supposed that, when happier days arrive, we shall not gladly participate in many of them again and find relief and respite in the relaxation they will afford. But this is the point: Through our experience we have caught such a view of life and of the things which count in life, we are resolved, God helping us, to live our life on a different plane from that upon which it has been lived for some time. What worried us once on a day is of no consequence to us now. The little irritations which disturbed our equanimity and sundered friendships annoy us no longer. The prizes which we coveted and to possess ourselves of which all our energies were directed have lost their attraction. We are determined to give ourselves to big things, to the things which count and which remain.

Yes, it is true in this regard also. If the hour has been dark, it has not been without its stars. Treasures which we did not possess before the darkness descended upon us are ours now. We have discovered something about life.

III. We have discovered something about one another—how much each of us needs the other, of what service one can be to another.

The conditions amid which others live, the suffering others are called to endure, the burdens others are called to carry, are plain for all to see. But whereas in other days sympathy with the less fortunate was confined only to some in a community, and whereas some were prepared to leave the care of the sorrowing to any who felt constrained to assist them, now we are all sympathetic and are at pains to be of service as opportunity affords. Talk to anyone in tram or train or bus and what is the burden of his conversation? In most cases it is of his concern for those upon whom the weight of our present dark experiences has fallen most heavily.

Recently I talked with a friend whose home is in a very select, residential district, and whose account of the change perceptible in his area I found interesting. Prior to these dark days his neighbours and he were content to bid each other a formal 'good-morning' or 'good-evening,' and indeed, according to this man's report, found it much more entertaining to speak of, than to, one another. But present conditions have effected a veritable transformation. Now each is concerned for all and all for each; and if any is called to bear a burden of which others are mercifully relieved there is an eagerness to share what part of it can be shared. Through our very agonies which we all so deeply regret and deplore we have discovered a community sense, a bond of brotherhood, a fellowship of sympathy and of service.

Yes, it is true in this regard also. The hour may have been dark, but it has not been without its stars. The experience may have been difficult, but it has not been without its compensations.

'I will give thee,' said God, 'the treasures of darkness.' I should like all who can only see the darkness to-day to see the treasures which have become ours because of the darkness. I should like all who are of opinion that the outcome of our present experience can only be desolate to bear in mind the things of which we have spoken. A consciousness both of our need of God and of the Grace of God, a realization of the bigness and of the goal of life, an awareness of our need of one another—are such things of little consequence? Was it not that men might possess such things that Jesus Christ came and that Jesus Christ died?

NINETEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Our Essential Bread: An Address in Harvest.

BY THE REVEREND C. M. HEPBURN, B.D., CRIEFF.

'Give us day by day our daily bread.'—Lk 11^3.

At the moment that is a very widespread prayer, but from what economists tell us of the state of Europe sharp necessity may soon make it more than ever before an urgent prayer. And yet may it not be that the world's concentration in recent years almost solely upon 'material' bread and other nourishment of a similar nature, as though these things in themselves were sufficient to satisfy men, and its neglect to minister to other and deeper needs as well, may that not be one of the reasons why that co-operation has been impossible which

could have ensured to all men everywhere in God's good providence and in bounteous plenty their 'daily bread'? It may therefore be helpful to translate our Saviour's words more widely, and it is by no means straining their meaning, as 'our essential bread,' as assuredly for life in the largest sense there are more things essential than 'ordinary' bread.

Of course that is in no way to minimize the vital importance of that bread which is the staple food of our bodies, for like anyone else the most soulful of us must eat to live.

It may not therefore be a bad thing altogether that we should be stabbed into recognizing how indispensable to all of us is the regular and unfailing provision of the fruits of the soil, the produce of the hard labour of man, and the ordering of the Lord by whose all-wise ordaining it is that we have the annual miracle of seed-time, summer, and harvest. A life on substitutes would be scarcely worth living, even supposing, and it is not certain, that one could exist on such second-bests. It would soon, indeed, make us poor, pale shadows of our usual selves.

I suppose we must give the palm to the German people for being about the most industriously inventive of all. Indeed, there are few things for which they have not found some fairly satisfactory 'ersatz' material, but one of these things, a vital exception, for which hitherto no adequate substitute has been found, is the food or bread we need for the building of a strong, active, and healthy body. In 1917, in a pill-box on Passchendaele, I saw some specimens of German inventive genius in a pack which had been left hurriedly lying. It contained among other interesting items a bandage which was woven of paper, a packet of leaves of some sort or other in place, I imagine, of tea or coffee, a so-called egg-powder that appeared to have had little acquaintance with an egg, and a lump of black-looking, sourish substance which posed as bread. In view of such fare, unappetizing and unsustaining, no wonder those who fell captive into our hands snatched in their hunger at a crust.

Although the intervening years since the Great War have seen a record rush of inventions, our ingenuity, it is worth noting, has not yet been able to make us independent of that first necessity of existence, 'our essential bread.' It shows, therefore, the crass folly, doesn't it, of any nation giving preference to 'guns' over 'butter,' and so, through fear, forcing into the uniformed 'unemployed' millions of workers who should be producing the food of the world, our daily bread.

All would not be well, however, though our larders were full to overflowing and we were like the affluent man who wanted to put up for himself bigger barns, for it is an attenuated existence when no attempt is made to provide that other very essential bread, food for the mind. After all, the life is more than the meat, as the Saviour said. One needs more to live on than bread and butter. One of our proudest endowments is mind; and no person ever attains his full stature with a well-fed body but a half-starved mind.

So we must seek sustenance for that part of us too or it may perish of mind starvation. It needs to be kept alive and growing by going on with the search after knowledge. I met an interesting character once, an old roadman in a roadside caravan. As far as schooling was concerned his education came to an end when he was twelve, but he still hungered after more. So he had taken up the study of biology and had read painstakingly, but with real understanding, through Darwin and Huxley and others whose works he had been able to procure. 'And yet,' you may say, 'he had remained only a roadman?' Apparently so; but all the more fully developed a man in not neglecting to turn to account a God-given gift and in eagerly seeking that bread of the mind which he had felt to be essential.

It may, however, possibly be said that the present is not an appropriate time for such a pursuit, for there is another and more important job on hand. I am not so sure. A well-nourished mind will, far from weakening any one, help immensely to increase his stamina in the struggle. In a leaflet message recently issued to the men in the King's forces, Dr. John Macbeath of Glasgow, for instance, says, 'Do not let your reading go to pieces! As opportunity offers keep yourself in touch with the best literature.' It is very wise advice. So let us not think that there's no need now for the fortification of the mind with good literature, for it, equally with the body, must get for its welfare its 'essential bread.' And in truth isn't one of the factors in the totalitarian tragedy the forced starvation of the mind?

In conclusion, however, man who was made 'a living soul' must very earnestly see to it that, while there is plenty of bread in his cupboard and the finest of literature on his bookshelves, there is also obtainable that food which is proper and essential to the welfare of his soul.

Such bread, for instance, is God's gift of beauty, although vandal hands are hard at work blasting so much of it into nothingness now. On the spiritual

value of the beautiful no argument at all should be needed. Admittedly beauty will not save us, but life is enriched and uplifted by it, and, lacking it, is sorely impoverished. Some may find this food, for example, in the realm of architecture, like the late Sir Robert Lorimer, architect of our Scottish National Shrine in Edinburgh, who, speaking of his introduction to the glories of architecture in his class at the University, said, 'Once a week my imagination was stirred, windows were opened for me into a new world of beauty, and I got the kind of food I was capable of absorbing.' And others may get the kind best suited to them in music, and art, and, it may be most readily, in the scenes above and about us, of star and sun and river and mountain and flower and forest. Anyhow he is wise who doesn't forget that in beauty's domain there is bread for his soul.

Who hath two loaves against the morrow stored
In careful forethought for the festal board,
Let him sell one: conscious of greater need
Let him buy lilies, who his soul would feed.

But, further, the earnest soul will find this essential bread given by God in the Book of books, the Bible itself. It is said Henry M. Stanley had in his baggage in Africa a number of books. As the native carriers deserted, volume after volume had to be discarded. At length there were only two books left, a copy of Shakespeare and the Bible; and had Stanley been forced to discard one more I feel sure it wouldn't have been the Bible. Because while there is sustenance for the soul in 'every word which proceedeth out of the mouth of God,' which applies, I consider, to all good books, none can sustain, and guide, and strengthen us as the Bible does, which experience is not wrong in pronouncing 'the Word of God.' In this field we may then find ample store of golden grain.

In His Son, however, God has given us the true bread of Heaven, the indispensable bread of the soul. And this bread of life that He is, and has largely offered, is more essential than ever in these times. And of this bread the rare beauty is it isn't rationed. 'Come unto me' is the invitation. 'And whosoever will' is the only coupon. And, like the barrel of meal of old, for all we take as much is left over to be taken. So, that we may not grow faint neither be weary, may we everyone of us thankfully take the bread offered by God, which is so absolutely 'essential' to the well-being of our soul.

'Twas August, and the fierce sun overhead
Smote on the squalid streets of Bethnal Green,
And the pale weaver, through his windows seen
In Spitalfields, looked thrice dispirited.

I met a preacher there I knew and said,
'Ill and o'erworked how fare you in this scene?'
'Bravely,' said he, 'for I of late have been
Much cheered with thoughts of Christ *the living bread*.'

All in all then it will be well to make our thanksgiving not alone for the harvest of the fields, but for that sustenance for mind and soul that Almighty God in His goodness and wisdom so plentifully provides and affords.

TWENTIETH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Discipline of Suffering.

BY THE REVEREND CHARLES SMITH, B.A.,
ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE, DURHAM.

'. . . Though he was a Son, yet learned obedience by the things which he suffered.'—He 5^8 (R.V.).

1. The Epistle to the Hebrews here puts into words more definitely than any other part of the New Testament the fact that the Agony of our Lord in the Garden of Gethsemane was more than just the natural fear of a dreadful death that any one who was fully man might be expected to feel. Until He had undergone this night of mental anguish, says the writer, Our Lord might indeed be perfect man: He might have known temptation: He might have a genuine human body and a full insight into the feelings of His fellow-men: He might see clearly into the very thoughts of their hearts and speak to them words that were the words of eternal life. But there was one thing that He would have lacked but for that evening of acute distress in the Garden. He would never have known the temptation to give up the object for which He knew that His Father had set Him apart: He would never have known, in other words, the obedience to a harsh duty—the obedience won at the cost of mental turmoil. And without that He would never have been a complete and perfect man. For I am sure that one of the most typical features of our human character is the temptation to give up in face of harsh experience; to be unwilling to persevere in attaining goals that prove costly; to rest from the ploughing, as it were, that puts an unexpectedly severe strain upon our muscles; to resent the discipline that we know in our hearts to be for our good.

These are all to some extent characteristics of all of us. We always want to do just what we want, when we want, and how we want. We are impatient and petulant if everything does not go exactly as we would have liked it to go. We rage at our friends, our parents, our subordinates, in the case of our ordinary everyday affairs; and, much worse, we rail at God when the inconvenience is on a bigger or more important plane, or when it hurts more. That, I am sure, is one of the great errors of the religious life of very many people. Our Lord learned that the perfection of His manhood required completion in discipline hardly won through suffering. If it were necessary for Him who was without any of the weaknesses of character from which the rest of us suffer so badly, it does not require a great effort of imagination to see how vastly greater is our need to learn obedience likewise to the demands made upon us by God. And there is no other way of learning obedience to a hard duty than by undergoing willingly the hardship that it demands.

2. We deprive ourselves of a good deal of help and comfort because we are unwilling to face the fact that God Himself can suffer with our suffering. There seems, for some reason, to be an objection to thinking of our Heavenly Father as doing other than govern the world without any emotion; as though He looked down upon the world that He created and which He has loved so well, and saw its disasters with nothing more than a shrug of the shoulders. I do not believe this. I am convinced that He must suffer with the sorrows of His beloved creation; and that, even though it be necessary for our growth of character that we go through the fires of adversity, yet God Himself feels with us and knows the strain to which we are submitted. We all want and need sympathy, and there is no sympathy so deep as that of God. He has known in the person of His Son the worst that the world can do to a man; in our every affliction He is afflicted; He can see right into our hearts with an intimacy that no human friend, parent, or lover can ever hope to equal; and there is in Him a wealth of consolation and strength and pity, if we will but tap it.

3. It is easy to think in these terms when we are happy. It is easy to look back upon our misfortunes at a distance and realize that God had not forgotten us while we were suffering them. What is not so easy is to hold on at the actual time that we are undergoing trial. And that is just the time when we need to hold on. How we are to avoid giving up is, I think, well put in the report of the last expedition of Scott to the South Pole. There are recorded in it accounts of blizzards so severe that we, in our more kindly climate, cannot really quite imagine what they were like. A man going, say, five yards from the tent, is not able to find it again, and is found at the door dead when the ice has ceased to whirl down. But it is the behaviour of those in the tent to which I want to draw your attention. At the first sign of storm they shut up the door of their little tent; everything that can be fastened is securely fixed; those inside roll themselves in their sleeping-bags and wait for the storm to come. While it is howling around their fragile little home they do nothing. It is no time for movement, no time for progress. It is a time for keeping a firm hold on the things that they already have. When the storm has subsided they can come out from their shelter. The snow, they find, is piled high above them. They have been on the point of suffocation. On the point, but no more. They have been saved by having something to shelter behind, something to cling to. They have not added to their knowledge or their possessions: it is no time for experiment or progress: it is a time for finding out what are the things that you want to rescue from the storm and for getting them quickly into the tent with you, prepared to wait until the blizzard has gone before you venture your head out of doors. There was nothing weak or defeatist about their behaviour. They saw that there was nothing to be done, and so they did nothing—which was sound common sense. And they did save both their lives and their possessions.

That illustrates very well what a Christian man will do in the time of adversity. When he sees things about him in a stormy state, he will make sure that at least the truths which have brought him consolation in times past will under no attack be wrenched from him.

4. What are these things to be? They vary a good deal for each of us. For my own part, I should say something like this: First, I shall always remember that God knows and that God cares and that nothing can ever separate me from His love. For that has been shown to me, not only in His Son who gave Himself for me, but in a numberless crowd of other and everyday occurrences. The beauty that He has opened my eyes to see; the love that He has given me to know; the spirit that He has awakened in me to seek and to have fellowship with Him. These are things which no storm of life can ever shake.

Secondly, I shall always remind myself that,

though the evil may seem for a time to hold sway, yet it is, by its very nature, a temporary thing; but that the thing which abides through all the changes of the world is the good. For the good is the manifestation of the life of God, and the life of God can never be done away or brought to impotence. The evil by which we may from time to time be almost overwhelmed may affect our flesh; but our spirit lives and feeds upon the things that cannot be moved.

Thirdly, I shall remind myself that, as with Christ, so with me, unquestioning obedience to the will of God must be learned through the things that are endured. And I shall count it a gain, if by the clinging to the spiritual truths that have meant much to me, they shall emerge strengthened. I think that they will.

Like the explorers who stayed in their tent until the storm had passed, we shall have clung to, and been sheltered by, the things that we already possessed. It will have been a test. But it will have been a test that has added to our knowledge of the spiritual truths that had value for us. We shall have concentrated on them, and we shall be grateful to them for the shelter that they have given to our faith. Our religion should then be more complete as our manhood should be more complete.

Recent Biblical Archaeology.

By the Reverend J. W. Jack, D.D., Glenfarg, Perthshire.

Cities and Villages.—The ancients, who knew nothing of the origin of towns or cities, had the idea that they had existed from the beginning of the human race. The Babylonians, for instance, imagined that the art of building cities and temples, together with other useful knowledge, had been learnt in the earliest ages from the god Ea, who had emerged for this purpose from the abyss or underworld; and according to Biblical tradition, Cain was the builder of a city which he named after his son Enoch (Hebrew, *Ḥanôk*). The fact, however, is that in Palestine at least, and as a general rule in the Near East, the oldest remains of cities so far discovered do not ante-date the last phase of the Stone Age (*c.* 3000 B.C.). Most of the Canaanite cities, indeed, arose much later than this, when the country became divided up into small independent States or principalities, each under the authority of a petty 'king' or ruler. Every such State, though covering a radius of only ten or twenty miles, had a 'city' as its capital, and included villages, pasture lands, cultivated fields, and other rural territory, all of which formed its *gebûl*—a Hebrew term usually translated 'border' or 'coast,' and often used in the collective plural like Latin *fines* (cf. Nu $35^{26.\ 27}$, Jg 1^{18}, Ezk $47^{16.\ 17}$, Am 6^{2}, 1 S 5^{6}, 2 K 15^{16}, etc.). The tendency of the Semites to express all kinds of relationship in terms of kith and kin led them to regard these rural communities as 'daughters' of the city or central community with which they were connected (cf. Jos 17^{11} R.V., 'Beth-shean and her daughters,' 'Ibleam and her daughters,' etc.), while the city itself was spoken of as the 'mother' (cf. 2 S 20^{19}, 'Thou seekest to destroy a city and a mother in Israel').

Cities.—The city or town was generally a fortified place and thus practically inaccessible to the enemy (cf. Nu $32^{17.\ 36}$, Jos 10^{20}, 1 S 6^{18}, etc.). The usual Hebrew term was *'îr* (pl. *'ârîm*), but *Ḳiriah* (construct, *Ḳiriath*) was often used in poetic descriptions and nearly always in the formation of proper names, as Kiriath-jearim ('city of thickets'), Kiriath-sepher ('city of books'), Kiriath-ḥuṣôth ('city of streets'), etc. A later poetic form *Ḳereth*, allied to the Phœnician (*K-r-t*), is met with in Job and Proverbs (cf. Job 29^{7}, Pr 8^{3} 9^{3}), while Karak or Karkâ occurs in Aramæan (cf. 'Karak Hispasina' in a North Semitic inscription, and Kerak, the name of 'Ar of Moab' (Is 15^{1}) in modern times).

Palestine cities were not so large as generally imagined. Their area rarely exceeded about twenty-five acres, while many of them covered no more than seven to twelve. Their population was increased during the rainy season, and being places of refuge they were naturally filled to overflowing whenever hostile invasions occurred. On the other hand, the population decreased greatly during the summer period, being largely confined at such a time to the public officials, shopkeepers, merchants, artisans, and men of arms. The majority of the

inhabitants repaired to the country, with its vines, farms, and cultivated grounds, and installed themselves under tents or in huts, as is done frequently at the present day in Mediterranean countries. Sometimes the royal household followed the custom, and retired to country quarters: thus the kings of Samaria seem to have had a summer residence at Jezreel (1 K 18^{45}, 2 K 8^{29}).

The rise of cities with their concentrated population brought with it a number of difficult problems. A city, for instance, could only be established in proximity to a water supply, which moreover had to be within easy reach in case of siege or similar danger; it had to be on a healthy site, away from low-lying ground and stagnant pools; it had to be placed where there was some hope of trading and of economical development; it required to be on some strategic site for the safety of the inhabitants; and if it was to be a strongly fortified place, the site had to dominate the surrounding country and control the main routes. For reasons of this nature, many cities, such as Gezer and Samaria, were practically built on high ground, isolated on all sides. Shechem (*Balaṭa*) and Debir (*Beit Mirsim*) were protected to some extent by ravines, and had the benefit of rocky spurs adjoining them. Some of the cities in the plains, such as *Tell Jemmeh* (Gerar?) and *Tell el-Fârah* (Beth-pelet?), were placed on the elevated ground (sometimes with a steep face) within the loop of a *wâdi* or torrent. More often perhaps the city occupied an elevated plateau, attached by a 'mole' or narrow strip of ground to the neighbouring land, as we find in the case of Megiddo and Beth-Shemesh, which were planted on the rounded terminal brow of a range of hills. The strength of such a position was great if the 'mole' formed an upward approach to the city, and was narrow enough to be blocked. Azeḳah (*Tell Zakariyeh*), for instance, which was placed on a projecting spur, was connected with the mountain range by a rather slender 'peduncle,' which it overhung by more than a hundred feet. It was different with early Jerusalem: though well protected on the east by the Cedron Valley and on the west by the Tyropœan, it was open and exposed on the north where the ground formed a wide declivity towards the city. Many cities which happened to have an elevated piece of ground within the surrounding wall added to their security by erecting an acropolis or citadel on this spot, with defences and enclosures of its own.

Villages.—Villages, on the other hand, were unfortified, and simply consisted of a collection of huts or roughly made 'cabins' hardly distinct from the dwellings of semi-nomads. The usual Hebrew word for such an assemblage of houses was *ḥaṣer*, which at first designated the temporary enclosure of brushwood and rough dry-stone in which the shepherds kept their flocks, and beside which they raised their tents (cf. Lv 25^{31}, Jos 13^{23}, etc.). Less often perhaps the term used was *kâfar* or *kôfer*, a word borrowed from the Aramæan (cf. Jos 18^{24}, 'the *kâfar* of the Ammonites'; 1 S 6^{18}, 'the *kôfer* of the peasantry,' translated 'country villages' in A.V. and R.V.). It is noteworthy that during the monarchical period village life developed considerably, as a result of the agricultural policy of some of the more far-sighted kings, such as Uzziah of Judah, who, we are told, 'loved husbandry,' and kept 'fruitful fields' with many 'husbandmen' and 'much cattle' (2 Ch 26^{10}). The situation of rural communities, however, which in many cases were simply open encampments, made them very precarious and unsafe, owing partly to the rivalry existing between neighbouring kingships and partly to the constant incursions of bedouin bands from the desert. This fact explains our lack of archæological information regarding them, for the peasant's hut leaves almost as little trace as the nomad's tent. Any vestiges of note consist of a few potsherds and perhaps some silos or cisterns or presses of little interest, and not sufficient to attract excavation.

Beth-Shemesh ('City of the Sun').

An excellent instance of the vicissitudes through which Palestinian cities passed in the course of the ages is furnished in the story of Beth-Shemesh as told by its excavator, Dr. Elihu Grant, of Haverford College, America, in his latest publication. The site is represented by the mound of *Rumeileh*, near the little ruined village of *'Ain Shems*, and about nine hundred feet above sea-level. It was examined and partly dug into by Dr. Duncan Mackenzie in 1911 and 1912, but it has now been completely and most satisfactorily excavated by Grant, who has carried through no less than five campaigns on the spot, extending from 1928 to 1933. Six distinct levels, representing successive cities, have been found. The sixth or lowest may be dated *c.* 2200–1700 B.C., and its destruction, whatever the cause, must have been complete, as practically every trace of it, except only a few fragments of pottery, has disappeared.

The Hyksos City.—With the fifth level, ending *c.* 1500 B.C. and corresponding with the Hyksos epoch, an entirely new period opened for the city. The first remains of building construction now

appear, and during this period, probably sometime in the seventeenth century, the city was surrounded for the first time by a rampart, which remained till at least 1500 B.C.

The Egyptian City.—The fourth level, extending to *c.* 1200 B.C., covers the late Bronze Age, and corresponds to the Egyptian domination established and maintained by the Pharaohs of the eighteenth and nineteenth dynasties. It represents the most prosperous period of the city's life, when the population benefited, as all Palestine did, from the Egyptian and Ægean commerce. A tongue-shaped ostrakon, containing two lines of cuneiform writing, was found in this level. It must be dated sometime between 1400 and 1200 B.C., and has not yet been deciphered to the satisfaction of scholars. It is to the credit of Dr. W. F. Albright to have noted that the writing is in the Ras Shamra alphabet, and can best be read with the aid of a mirror. The end of this fourth level is marked not only by a change in the nature of the houses, but by deep beds of ashes in many parts. The destruction may have been the work of the Israelites. If Mount *Heres* (Jg 1^{35}) is identical with Beth-Shemesh, as seems likely (since *heres* and *shemesh* both='sun'), we gather that the Israelites were unable to take possession of the city at their invasion under Joshua (*c.* 1400 B.C.), and it is quite possible that they attacked and laid it waste later on. The destroyers, however, may have been the Philistines, for Beth-Shemesh seems to have been in their hands before the close of this period, as Timnah which was quite near to it (Jg 14^{1}) certainly was, and as the Samson episodes seem to imply.

The Philistine City.—The third level, which continued till *c.* 1050 B.C., is distinguished by the so-called 'Philistine' pottery, which is not actually that of the Philistine home-land, but a painted composite type borrowed from all kinds of Mycenæan, especially from the Cypriote and Rhodian varieties, and combined with native elements. Another interesting feature of this level is the presence of installations connected with bronze and iron work, which lends corroboration to the statement in 1 S 13^{19-21}, according to which the monopoly of this work was in the hands of the Philistines to such an extent that the Israelites were actually deprived of smiths.

The Israelite City.—The Philistine city seems to have perished in a violent catastrophe, and was succeeded by another (represented by the second level, 1050–586 B.C.), from which the particular pottery referred to disappears and is replaced by a much coarser type. That the city was now Israelite is evident from the fact that the Ark was transferred to it about this time (cf. 1 S 6^{10ff}), and the further fact that Israelite potters never showed any marked originality in their ware. What they have left behind almost everywhere is lumpy, badly baked, and inferior in many ways. The Israelite city continued without any serious changes until the sixth century B.C., when it was destroyed, no doubt by the Babylonian armies of Nebuchadrezzar in 587 B.C. In subsequent ages the tell was only occasionally occupied, but in the Byzantine epoch, probably in the fifth century, a monastery was established on it, the excavation of which has not revealed anything of importance.

Value of Tablets.

It is largely through these ancient clay documents, now being unearthed in large numbers throughout the Near East, that we are able to secure accurate knowledge about Palestine and neighbouring countries in Old Testament times. They form an unbroken series from the beginning of the third millennium B.C. down through the time of the Jewish monarchy to the Christian era, giving us information regarding the religious beliefs, economic conditions, and daily life of the people, and enabling us to picture the old civilization, including that of the Hebrews, in its minutest details. The clay which was used has turned out to be practically indestructible, especially when it had been water-cleaned, freed from all impurities (leaves, straw, etc.), and carefully baked. A tablet or brick made of this material will retain its shape for thousands of years, even though lying buried in damp soil, and when dried will become as hard and good as ever. The writing on it can be washed in water, vigorously rubbed with a hard brush, and subjected to acids and other chemicals often supposed to be injurious, and yet will remain as fine and legible as when it left the hand of the scribe. Tablets were baked with particular care by the Babylonians, especially if they were intended for the libraries, where they were supposed to be handled and read frequently. The late Professor Chiera, who had long experience in digging up tablets in Mesopotamia, found that the chief damage to them, especially in moist ground (where they tend to become soft), arises from earthworms or small rodents, which sometimes make their way right through the clay, often leaving more than one hole behind them, and thus obliterating much of the writing.

It took long education and practice to write properly on clay in cuneiform characters. As far back as the days of Abraham regular schools,

generally connected with the temple or palace, existed for the purpose, and were conducted by experienced teachers, usually priests. Here would-be scribes were trained in religious, literary, commercial, scientific, and other branches of knowledge. Many of the text-books used (really tablets of clay, rather unwieldy) have been recovered from ancient sites in Mesopotamia and Syria. Some of these are writing models for the pupils, the left-hand side of the tablet containing the model, and the right-hand side being blank for the pupil to use. Lists of signs, amounting to many hundreds, were learned in this way, along with their phonetic values or ideographic meanings. Dictionaries were in existence, and signs generally taken from these included those for countries, cities, rivers, stars, gods, trees, stones, plants, woods, fish, birds, cattle, clothes, and innumerable other objects, as well as synonyms of words, verbal forms, etc. Scribal schools of this nature were in existence in every city of importance as far back as the third millennium. There must have been many such in Mesopotamia, and probably in Palestine, in the time of the patriarchs. There was a Record Office, too, within each large temple, where tablets relating to the business transactions of the State were kept, including lists of slaves, farm produce, estates, and similar matters, together with copies of royal edicts, decrees, correspondence with foreign kings, legal decisions, and official documents of all kinds. Private individuals generally kept their business documents buried in the ground under their house floors, and large numbers of such tablets have been recovered.

Tablets from Chagar Bazar (Syria).

Barley Food.—Mr. C. J. Gadd, of the British Museum, has given a most interesting report on the tablets found at this large tell in north-east Syria, south-west of Nisibin. They cover a period of seven or eight years, about the time of Abraham or a little later, though the great bulk of them belong to one and the same year. The ruler at the time was Jasmaḫ-Adad, a son of the King of Assyria, and a contemporary of Zimrilim, King of Mari. The territory was almost entirely agricultural. The staple of its wealth consisted in its cereals and cattle, and the king himself, in addition to keeping stags, gazelles, and birds (probably ostriches), also maintained numerous horses, asses, and oxen, for farming and draught purposes. It is not surprising, therefore, that practically all the tablets (eighty-one in number) have to do with agricultural products, especially barley, and detail the allowances of this particular cereal paid over to various workers, including women, boys, and girls, as well as the amount of it allotted for the upkeep of cattle and other farm animals. Barley, indeed, seems to have been the main agricultural product, and appears to have had three uses: (1) raw as fodder for animals, (2) ground and baked as bread and cakes, (3) brewed for purposes of drink. We mention this production of barley here, as the main food of the people, because it is in close accord with Old Testament statements and narratives. From patriarchal times onward, barley (*se'ôrah*) was one of the most characteristic products of Palestine (Dt 8^{8}), regarded as one of the chief necessaries of life. Other cereals grown were wheat, beans, lentils, millet, and spelt, but barley, in early Israelite times at least, was the staple food of all sections of the people, though later it was probably connected more with the poorer classes (2 K 4^{42}, Ru 2^{17}, Ezk 4^{12}; cf. Jn $6^{9.\ 13}$). Hence it is taken as a type of the Israelite peasant army in the dream of the Midianite, overheard by Gideon (Jg 7^{13}). The barley harvest was a recognized date (cf. Ru 1^{22}, 2 S $21^{9.\ 10}$), varying to some extent in each district according to the altitude. In the tablets referred to there are also barley allowances for horses, and this too is in close accord with the Old Testament, where this cereal is referred to as the chief food of such animals (1 K 4^{28}).

The Name Jacob.—Another interesting fact in the tablets from this tell is the occurrence in three of them of the personal name 'Jacob-el' (Nos. 988, 989, 995), *Ia-ah-qu-ub-el*, equivalent to Hebrew יעקבאל. This appears to have been the original form of the name, the elliptical 'Jacob' being probably of later date. Such forms with *-ēl* ('God') were common in early Hebrew times (cf. *Jabne'el*, Jos 15^{11}=Jabneh, 2 Ch 26^{6}), *Yipta'el* (Jos $19^{14.\ 27}$= Yiptah, Jg 11^{1}, etc.). The occurrence of the name Jacob in these tablets is an additional evidence that, like the names Abraham, Joseph, and others, it was much older than the date of the patriarchs. Even the name *Isre-ēl* also occurs on a Babylonian cylinder-seal of the era of Narâm-Sin (*c.* 2680 B.C.), several hundred years before it was given to Jacob.

Neo-Babylonian Tablets.

Miss E. W. Moore has recently published a series of ninety-six of these tablets, accompanied by copies of the original texts. They cover the period from the reign of Nabopolassar (626 B.C.) down through the Achæmenid Dynasty to the Seleucid era (*c.* 300 B.C.), and deal with business and commercial matters during the reigns of such well-known kings as Nebuchadrezzar, Nabonidus, Cyrus,

Cambyses, Darius, Xerxes, and others. Among other items of interest to Old Testament scholars may be mentioned the following:

(1) In tablet No. 89 (l. 41), which has no date, we find the expression or title *bêl tēmu*. This is the exact equivalent of the Aramaic בְּעֵל טְעֵם in Ezr $4^{8.\ 9.\ 17}$, where it is applied to a Babylonian official named Rehum and translated 'chancellor' (both in A.V. and R.V.), while the Septuagint wrongly takes it to be a proper name, Beeltethmus (Βεέλτεθμος). The Babylonian word *tēmu* signifies 'wisdom,' 'judgment,' and the official referred to seems to have been the 'lord of judgment,' *i.e.* probably the Babylonian king's administrator. This finds some corroboration at the end of tablet No. 9, where there is an ideogram ŠA-KU, which must be read *šakin tēmu*, and this is known to designate a high official often cited in administrative contracts. Sayce's idea that the expression *bêl tēmu* means 'lord of official intelligence' or 'postmaster' seems incorrect.

(2) At the beginning of tablet No. 53, dated from the twentieth year of Darius I., we read of *Ḫarima* son of *Padâ*. These are two Jewish names occurring frequently in the Books of Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah, under the form Harim (חָרִם or חָרִים) and Pedaiah (פְּדָיָה).

(3) In tablet No. 67, believed to belong to the Seleucid era, an official with the title *rab-mûngu* is mentioned. This expression also occurs in a contract tablet dating from the first year of Xerxes (486 B.C.), and is probably the same as *rab-mûgi* in some Assyrian tablets of the Sargonic period (722–625 B.C.). The official is probably to be identified with Rab-mag of the Old Testament (cf. Jer $39^{3.\ 13}$), but what his special duties were is not known.

The Living God in the Old Testament.

By the Reverend James Wood, M.A., Macclesfield.

1. With its genius for vivid expression the Old Testament offers us a striking name for God, namely, 'the Living God.'

This suggestive title may not readily lend itself to precise, theological treatment (cf. Kohler, *Theologie des Alten Testaments*, 36), but there is in it a quality which makes it eminently suitable for the language of religion.

Although the actual phrase 'the living God' is not of frequent occurrence, yet what it stands for permeates the whole of the Old Testament. 'Personality, implying a living Being, who thought, felt, and willed, and who possessed all the characteristics of personal life, is a distinctive feature of the God of the O.T. throughout' (*E.R.E.* vi. 254*a*).

The title is used in many different contexts. It is the living God who reveals Himself to Moses (Dt 5^{26}). Men cry out and thirst for the living God (Ps 42^{2} 84^{2}). When Joshua enters Canaan it is the living God who drives out the enemies (Jos 3^{10}). It is a mark of the heathen that he dares to reproach the living God (2 K 19^{4}, etc.). Even the false prophets in Israel may pervert the words of the living God (Jer 23^{36}). However, in a time of blessing, Israel shall be called the sons of the living God (Hos. 1^{10}).

When all the actual occurrences of the phrase are examined there is much to suggest that the name is more than a mere title. It is to these occurrences that we now turn.

2. Naturally, the name is used as a title. God is adequately described as the living God. As a title, it is used in combination with other titles to add emphasis and dignity. There are two examples of this in the Book of Jeremiah. God is not only 'the true God . . . and an everlasting king,' He is also 'the living God' (10^{10}). Further, 'the Lord of hosts our God' is 'the living God' (23^{36}).

3. A characteristic of this living God is that He is watchful. There are men, false prophets, who indeed, 'have perverted the words of the living God' (Jer 23^{36}). Nevertheless, such men cannot thwart the purposes of the living God. He is watchful over His word 'to perform it' (Jer 1^{12}). As Skinner well says, 'In early Israel, and even in written prophecy, we find occasional traces of a crude conception of the word of God as endowed with an inherent, almost magical, efficacy, in virtue

of which it works out its own fulfilment. Traces of that idea occur even in the discourses of Jeremiah; but this vision seems to teach that in principle he had risen above it. The assurance that the word which he will speak in the name of Yahwe will not return to Him void rests on no belief in its self-fulfilling energy, but on the wakefulness of Yahwe —the ever-active, living, personal presence of One who knows the end from the beginning' (*Prophecy and Religion*, 32).

Thus we see that the idea of the living God had sufficient elasticity to make room for new aspects of the Divine nature as these were progressively apprehended in the deepening insight of a choice spirit like Jeremiah.

4. Since God is the living God it is not surprising that He is regarded as the source of life. 'God possesses life in Himself, and is the spring of all life in the universe' (*E.R.E.* vi. 255*a*). Not only does man cry out and thirst for God, but he recognizes that God is 'the fountain of life' (Ps 36^{9}). What this thought contains is hardly appreciated by us who live in a well-watered land. As has been said in comment on this passage, 'One must realize the fear of hunger which every failure of the winter rain meant to Palestine, in order to enter into the joy with which the rain is here greeted' (Hans Schmidt, *Die Psalmen*, 69). In a profound sense it was a matter of life and death whether or not God was the fountain of life.

Jeremiah takes this same thought and gives it a more intensely religious application. 'They have forsaken me the fountain of living waters' (2^{13}). Instead of turning to the living God men had gone off after lifeless idols. 'The Baals are not merely abominations but nonentities, and "they that trust in them are like to them" (Ps 115^{8} 135^{18}), because a life devoted to such service receives no reinforcement from the one real and unfailing Source of spiritual succour and energy' (Skinner, *op. cit.*, 71). God, the living God, is alone the source from which all life, physical and spiritual, is derived.

5. The context wherein the title is used is worthy of attention. Frequently the title seems to be used to emphasize the difference between Yahweh and heathen gods. Jeremiah contemptuously describes the manufacture of idols. In colourful detail he describes the silver plates, the art of the goldsmith and the blue and purple embroidery, 'they are all the work of cunning men.' But, 'he is the living God' ($10^{9.10}$).

In the Book of Daniel (ch. 6) Darius questions Daniel about Yahweh. But it should be noted that he addresses Daniel as the servant of the living God. Also, in v.^{26}, Darius decrees that all his subjects shall worship the God of Daniel, 'for he is the living God.'

Related to this implicit contrast with heathen gods is the use of the title when the Israelite calls upon God to defend His honour against the slanderous words of the heathen. David is wrathful that Goliath 'should defy the armies of the living God' (1 S $17^{26.36}$). The servants of Hezekiah complain to Isaiah that the Rabshakeh of Sennacherib has reproached 'the living God' (1 K 19^{4}, etc.).

We may see in this, of course, an expression of that intense zeal for the honour of Yahweh, as the one and only living God, whereas the gods of the heathens are but idols. But, at the same time, we have to remember that the Old Testament does not always and consistently repudiate the existence of other gods. There are some passages where the existence of other gods is admitted (Ex 15^{11}, Dt 6^{14}, Ps 135^{5}, etc.). Nevertheless, there are other passages which definitely deny their existence (Dt 4^{19} *passim*, Ps 96^{5}, etc.).

However, it is hardly proper to leave these apparent inconsistencies lying side-by-side and unreconciled. We have to recognize that in the Old Testament there are higher levels and lower levels, that some expressions belong to Israel's highest and truest thinking, whereas other expressions are simply on a lower plane. It was given only to the choicest spirits among the Israelites to see that the living God was the only God. 'It is only gradually seen distinctly, and taught explicitly, not only that Jehovah is unique *among* "other gods," but that "other gods" have no real existence whatever beside Him' (Driver, *Deuteronomy* in *ICC*, 91).

The Old Testament outlook on idols is very different from our modern attitude. In our day we make a distinction between the idol and the god it represents. This distinction is foreign to the Old Testament way of thinking. 'An idol was taken to be a god and not merely the embodiment of a god. Likeness and identity are one: Jezebel calls Jehu "thou Zimri" (2 K 9^{31}), and one could speak of "(very) David" (Ezk 34^{23} 37^{24}), or "Elijah" (Mal 4^{5})' (S. A. Cook, *The Old Testament*, 105).

It would appear then, that although the Old Testament as a whole does not assert that God is God alone in an exclusive sense, yet in its conception of the living God it is pointing towards the conclusion that Yahweh alone is living and that other gods are but lifeless idols.

6. There is another usage of the idea, if not the actual term, 'living God,' which calls for separate discussion. This is seen in the formulæ of oaths, the most common form of which is, 'as the Lord liveth.' This oath is found frequently. It is, of course, a legitimate inference that the very frequency of such oaths suggests that the formula is somewhat conventional. In earlier and less sophisticated times, such an oath would be charged with all the mysterious awe and reverence possible to a devout worshipper. The name of God would be invoked only by him who was a devotee of God. But, with the passing of time, it may be argued, this sense of a vital relationship between him who swore the oath, and the God whose name was invoked would recede into the background. This may be true. But it must not be baldly assumed that every form of the oath is conventional. No doubt the majority of the oaths conform to a more or less stereotyped pattern, but there are exceptions to this. These exceptions must now be considered.

There are three formulæ which are slightly different from the usual oath formula. They are: (*a*) 'As the Lord thy God liveth' (1 K 17^{12} 18^{10}). (*b*) 'As the Lord, the God of Israel, liveth' (1 S 25^{34}, 1 K 17^{1}). (*c*) 'As the Lord of hosts liveth' (1 K 18^{15}, 2 K 3^{14}).

Each of these formulæ is used twice as compared with about forty times for the more usual formula.

The first thought which arises is that these uncommon formulæ are simply stylistic variations of the common formula. But rather than lock the door against another view, it may be advisable to consider the possibility of the difference being more than a literary artifice.

It is noteworthy that in five cases out of six,[1] the phrases are used in a context wherein it was important to emphasize the fact that the living God was THE GOD OF ISRAEL.

On four occasions the principal figure on the one hand is Elijah, and on the other, either the widow of Zarephath or Ahab or Obadiah the servant of Ahab. In the remaining case the characters are Elisha and Jehoram. Now, it will be noticed that the widow of Zarephath (1 K 17^{12}) was speaking in a foreign land, presumably under the suzerainty of Zidon Baal. Further, Ahab, Obadiah, and Jehoram, all represent a point of view opposed to the unique authority of Yahweh in Israel. The living God, in these instances, was being named in the presence of those who were prepared to worship 'other gods.' In these circumstances it may well be that the departure from the more conventional formula may have been due to a deeper religious insight which demanded to be expressed in less conventional phraseology.

Naturally, it is not claimed that the formulæ just discussed provide sufficient evidence 'to prove a case.' But they have been brought forward in the hope of showing that, despite the deadening effect of convention, faith in the living God still persisted. For, when the occasion arose, men swore by the living God who was the God of Israel.

7. Connected with oaths there is a usage where God swears by Himself. The formula is 'as I live.' It occurs twenty-three times, and of these, sixteen are found in the Book of Ezekiel. But, as Cooke says (*Ezekiel* in *ICC*, 60) this 'is in accordance with his austere conception of the reality of the divine Being. . . .' This form of the oath also points us to the same conclusion, that the God of Israel is the real and living God.

Attention may be directed to what has been called 'a rabbinical refinement' (Gesenius, *Hebrew Grammar*, 93*aa*, footnote). According to the Massoretic Text, when God swears by Himself, the pointing of 'live' is חַי = ḥay. But when man swears by God, the pointing of 'live' is חֵי = ḥey. Interestingly enough, in what is perhaps the only example of 'live' as applied to a false god, 'As thy God, O Dan, liveth,' the pointing is חֵי=ḥey. Harper (*Amos and Hosea* in *ICC*, 186) commenting on Am 8^{14} says that the Massoretes 'reserved חַי for oaths sworn by Yahweh, and used חֵי in oaths sworn by false gods and other non-enduring persons and things.'

No doubt this is a rabbinical refinement. But that does not mean that no more is to be said about it. For such a refinement, coming at such a late date in the history of the Old Testament, points to a great religious fact, namely, the tenacity with which the Israelites held to the view that their God was not only the one true God, but the only living God, thus illustrating what Dr. Wheeler Robinson has claimed (*Record and Revelation*, 323, ed. by H. Wheeler Robinson) 'Just because Yahweh is a living God, He remains adequate to the growth of the spiritual demands upon Him in the life of the successive generations. . . .'

[1] The exception is 1 S 25^{34} where David addresses Abigail.

Entre Nous.

'Alive unto God.'

The leader in *St. Martin's Review* for August is a great call by Canon S. J. Marriott of Westminster for a moral and religious awakening in the nation.

He sees in the chaos in which Europe is seething a struggle between the organic and the inorganic in which life will not be denied. A simple illustration is that from 'a dandelion growing in the middle of an asphalt pavement. It is a humble but vivid example of the irresistible power of life. Here is a struggle between the organic and the inorganic, between a tiny seed and a mass weight of dead matter: and the seed wins because it contains within itself the irresistible urge of life. The sign of its victory is a broken pavement; the reward of its victory, freedom to grow.'

Canon Marriott sees the strength of Hitler just here—he has effected the renaissance of Germany by a return to the sources of life. 'It is to blood, and race and soil that he has recalled the German people. . . . Now blood, race, and soil are essentially organic, and it was in opposition to the inorganic, primarily money and the mechanized form of civilization, that the Nazi revolution arose.'

It is not the powers of money, science, and politics that will defeat Hitlerism. 'These are the three forces which have moulded and controlled our civilization of recent years. Not only are they inanimate forces, but they are essentially the forms of power natural to the middle-aged and elderly, not to the young. When we are young it is the call of the blood not the call of the Stock Exchange that appeals to us; not the life of abstract thought but the life of actual adventure. A civilization which is dominated by science and finance is a civilization which has reached old age.'

Canon Marriott sees the soul of Germany as alive, 'terribly alive, devilishly alive, but alive.' 'That is our danger,' he says. 'England will never be secure till *her* soul comes alive, but in a grander, nobler way. That is why I long to see a great moral and spiritual awakening in the nation. Life can come from above as well as from below; it can be divine as well as demonic. What the British peoples need at this moment is passion to liberate, readiness to sacrifice, fearlessness to die. And where will you find those virtues so perfectly set forth as in that Christian faith which has played so large a part in our national history, our national character, our national traditions in the past? This is the life which cometh "from above," and it is at that source that the life of our land and Empire must be replenished. Nothing less will meet the needs of the hour.'

J. D. Jones.

Three Score Years and Ten (Hodder & Stoughton; 8s. 6d. net) is described on the paper cover as an autobiography. Dr. Jones himself in his Preface disclaims this and says the book is rather his recollections of great and good men of a by-gone age and also his recollections of movements—'in some of these movements I took a share.'

'Recollections' then rather than 'an autobiography.' They all make good reading, and we hope that Dr. Jones will still give us the more personal record.

There were few leading men in Congregationalism and in Church life generally that Dr. Jones did not know. Silvester Horne, Charles A. Berry and his son, Sidney Berry, Dr. Guinness Rogers, J. B. Paton are all here. Of J. B. Paton he says, 'I saw the beauty of holiness in him.' 'Parker had not the massive intellectual strength of Dale; he had not the exegetical clearness, the logical coherence and the restrained eloquence of Maclaren: he had not the perfect artistry of Jowett—he was rough-hewn like the Northumbria from which he hailed—he was boisterous, sometimes perhaps bombastic, but he had drama, he had passion, he had genius, he had great flashes of inspiration which made other preachers seem dull in comparison.' It was a speech of Dr. Parker's that influenced 'J. D.' in the movement which he led to wield Congregationalism from a number of separate churches into one great whole—into a unity where the stronger churches helped the weaker. It was his personal efforts that led to the institution of the great Central Fund of that Church.

Dr. Jones's work for reunion is well known and the part which he has played in the Lambeth Conversations. But it has never been one huge ecclesiastical organization that he has striven for. 'Our Lord Himself did not speak of one "fold" but of one

" flock." His sheep might shelter in half a dozen different folds, but they were nevertheless one " flock " because they listened to the Shepherd's voice and followed Him. That has always suggested to me the kind of union we ought to aim at—a unity that was consistent with variety: a unity brought about by a common faith and a common allegiance. That kind of unity I have done my best to promote.'

In the Epilogue Dr. Jones strikes a more personal note when he speaks of his own ministry and the beliefs which have animated him. 'I do not think I was ever swept away by the popular drift. It was not that I was insensible to social wrongs, but I believed the hurt of man lay deeper down. Better wages, better hours, better housing, better conditions generally—they were all desirable things, and on the platform I was always ready to plead for them. But the real mischief was more deep-seated. Perhaps it was my knowledge of my own heart and my own sense of need that made me feel the truth of our Lord's great word, " Except a man be born again, he cannot see the Kingdom of God." So all through my ministry I have been an Evangelical preacher. I have made it my business to proclaim to men the redeeming grace of God in Christ. I believe the new man in Christ can alone bring to pass the new world.'

The Good Shepherd.

C. F. Andrews was invited in 1937 by Dr. Raven to give a course of lectures in Pastoral Theology at Cambridge. He developed and amplified these talks later and they have now been published by Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton with the title *The Good Shepherd* (6s. net). This, his last message to us, is a call for personal preparation as He, the Good Shepherd, leads us forth from the fold and bids us follow in His steps. The second part of the message deals with practical work—how best we may feed those who are the 'sheep of His pasture.'

'One day, up above Matiana, on the Hindustan–Tibet Road, I saw a singularly beautiful sight, which opened out before me the whole vision of the shepherd at his work. . . . Just as we came to the place it seemed almost as if the Gospel story was being acted in a pageant before our eyes. The porter opened the door of the fold, and each shepherd came in turn and called his own sheep by name out of the fold. They heard his voice and obeyed, and he put them forth and went before them and the sheep followed him: for they knew their own shepherd's voice, but they would not recognize the voice of a stranger. In the shelter of the fold, during the night, there had been five or six flocks all mingled together. Each flock was small in number; perhaps a dozen or fifteen sheep would be as many as one shepherd would take with him for the day's pasture. As each shepherd came forward and called his own sheep by name, the one that was called would come running up at the sound of his voice, and in this way they brought forth their own sheep and thus separated the flocks from one another. Each sheep knew his own shepherd's voice. It was a happy sight to notice that the tie between the shepherd and his sheep was remarkably friendly. One sign of affection was this: the ewe mother, who had her lambs, would allow her own shepherd to take them up in his arms without any murmur. . . . The familiar words, " He shall gather the lambs in His arm and carry them in His bosom," meant much more to me when I saw this in action.'

Waste.

'" I don't want you to be mean," said Grandmother, " but I want you to realize that everything has some use and that nothing should be thrown away thoughtlessly. Cultivate the habit of taking care of your things and of remembering how much trouble went to the growing or making of them." How often we heard these words in our childhood! We were taught not to leave a single grain of rice in our bowl or to drop any on the table or floor. If we did, we were reminded that each single grain of rice had formed part of the farmer's labour during the season and caused him to worry about drought and flood. Money could not repay such labour. Moreover, we ought, we were told, to think of those who might not have had a single grain of rice to eat for some time. The principle of " no waste " extended to everything we ate or used. From late autumn to mid-spring we used to eat a sweet orange, like a tangerine but with a red peel. We never threw the peel away but dried it in the sun and kept it until some native drug-store sent a messenger to collect it. The dried peel was used to make a sedative, carminative stomach remedy.'[1]

[1] Chiang Yee, *A Chinese Childhood*, 293. (In his fascinating book, just published, Mr. Chiang Yee in telling of his own childhood has given an account of the customs of an old aristocratic Chinese family.)

Printed by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.